

**THE
MATRIX
REVEALED
Volume 1**

**JON RAPPOPORT
Interviews
JACK TRUE
(Part 3 of 3)**

December 17, 2009

A brief exchange with Jack.

Space is a collapsible item. It can be taken down like a stage set and later rebuilt, differently, in the twinkling of an eye.

Imagination does the rebuilding. And in doing so, transforms a life.

When I started painting in the fall of 1962, in New York, I experienced that in spades. Until that point, I pretty much assumed "the world" was the only space available.

In a small apartment in Manhattan, I painted day and night. I hung some of the finished work and the rest lay around me on the floor. To say each piece was its own world was not a metaphor, in my eyes.

It was an extreme confidence builder.

Imagination is always there: waiting. It's inexhaustible. It has no limits. It's not dependent on time or place. And in the launching of new spaces, it restores an ageless satisfaction.

The deepest Life has no clock. It doesn't creep along a line of advancing history. It moves out into endless improvisations.

Jack started out as a hypnotherapist, and then later changed his method of operation with patients, so that imagination became his primary tool. In the middle of one of our interviews, he said:

"Let's face it. Without imagination, we'd all be dead. We'd be robots. We might be trained to perform acts, but there would be no life in us, just a current of minimal electricity to keep the whole show going. The paradox is, most of us deny having an imagination. Or if we'll admit it, we say we don't know how to use it. What is that all about? And then, on top of this immense lie we're telling ourselves, we say we want a better world. A better world for whom? Robots? Is that what we're aiming for?"

At that point, I said, "The most direct road to imagination is art. You can't really avoid it. If you use your imagination long enough and widely enough, you end up doing art. But that seems to be a dirty word. People avoid it like the plague. They think you're consigning them to Hell. Art? No, anything but that. I'd rather dig ditches than make art."

Jack laughed and pointed out the window at the street. "You see that?" he said. "That's what people claim they want. Reality as it is. No frills, no add-ons. They just want what's real. They keep saying it over and over, and that's what's they damn well get. It's a full-blown phobia. So-called reality is the cover story everyone buys. And when you start to take the lid off the cover story, they protest. They're secret

agents of reality as it is, and you're taking away their legend, their handle, their job. You're exposing them to the enemy. Except there is no enemy. That's a myth. When you explode the myth, you're left with imagination. And art. That's all. No one is bringing us a new world. We make worlds."

###END###

June 29, 2010

HUMAN POTENTIAL

While I was working on my first book, AIDS INC in 1987, a mutual friend introduced me to Jack one afternoon at the UCLA Biomedical Library, where I was combing through medical journals.

Jack seemed to know a great deal about medical-research fraud. He pointed me to studies in the stacks, and then we sat down and had a long talk about animal research, and I learned more than I wanted to know about the cruelty of that industry.

At that time, I discovered that Jack was a hypnotherapist. I had always been interested in hypnosis. He suggested we meet again and talk about his research. This led to many dinners at a Chinese restaurant in Santa Monica, California.

A few days after AIDS INC. was published, Jack casually told me a copy of the book was in a diplomatic pouch heading to Moscow. I tried to press him, but he refused to give me details, except to say people in Russia would certainly be interested in my conclusions about the inaccuracy of the viral studies that had been carried out at the US National Institutes of Health.

As I discovered over the next five years of conversations, Jack had been approached by "government contractors," who were interested in his work on the cutting edge of human potential. Jack consistently turned down their offers.

After his untimely death in the mid-1990s, I went through my notes and tapes of our conversations. What emerged were the astounding findings of a unique mind. Spread out in front of me, in these notes, were wide-ranging and daring explorations of a researcher who was determined to extend the possibilities of human capacity.

Jack and I shared many ideas we had independently arrived out, from different routes. Painting had unlocked many doors for me. Jack had ventured into creative areas that went far beyond the traditional notion of hypnosis as a method for planting suggestions.

I'm happy to present, here, a compilation and re-editing of several of our interviews. I think you'll find, as you read Jack's remarks, that there IS something new under the sun. Jack had great disdain for limits, and he wasn't just pushing the envelope. He was pushing the envelope and the letter and the whole Post Office. He was a rare combination of researcher, artist, and rebel.

I call him the Spy in the House of Infinity.

Q: (Jon Rappoport) Why hypnosis?

A: (Jack True) At first, it was a fascination with the idea of changing beliefs. I could put a patient in a trance and make suggestions, and these suggestions would appear to alter the patient's inhibiting convictions.

Q: Why do you say "appear"?

A: Well, that's the point. It's a dead end. The patient keeps kicking out the new beliefs and retreating back to familiar territory.

Q: Give an example of a suggestion.

A: "You're happy." "You're satisfied with your life." "Your leg feels better." "You can run faster." "Your arm is healed."

Q: Seems pretty simple.

A: The immediate results can be tremendous. But, in most cases, they faded. The patient slips back.

Q: Given that this was what you were doing with patients, you must have become discouraged.

A: I wanted to go farther, understand more. I began looking for a system. I wanted a protocol that would do an end-run around the patient's tendency to fall back on old habits.

Q: A system.

A: You know, a better mechanism. A smarter approach. I wanted tricks. But that didn't work, either. It seemed as if something in the patient was much smarter than what I could devise.

Q: Smarter in what sense?

A: In remaining essentially passive.

Q: But if a patient were truly passive, wouldn't he then accept all your hypnotic suggestions and become different?

A: No. The kind of passivity I'm talking about is "staying the same." I found deeper levels, shall we say, where people want to stay the same. And when you look at what that is, you see it's an acceptance of a lowest common denominator of what they already are. It's like a person who drives his car a few miles to a lake, he's got his bathing suit on, he gets out of the car, he goes over to the lake, he sits down, and he stays there. He's in his bathing suit with a towel next to him, but he never goes in the water.

Q: What would happen if he did go in the water?

A: He'd feel something new. He'd have a new experience that would change his whole outlook on his future. It would be revolutionary for him.

Q: But that's why he went to the lake.

A: We don't know that. That's not definite. While he sits at the edge of the lake, he starts thinking about all sorts of things. And that rumination becomes the substitute for actually jumping in the lake. When he finally gets up and goes back to his car and drives home, he decides the rumination was why he really went to the lake. The rumination was enough. He rationalizes the whole trip and turns it into something acceptable. I have no problem with that. We all do it. But after he goes to the lake a few hundred times and never jumps into the water, he develops a kind of crust. He's shielded against a breakthrough. But think about this: Why is it that human beings can be hypnotized at all? I mean it's not inevitable in the scheme of things

Q: So what's the answer?

A: Most people want to give up their will to another person. They want that experience. They're waiting for it, so to speak. It's part of what they think of as life—like going to the movies.

Q: They want to surrender.

A: Not always, but yes.

Q: And this is because?

A: They think something good is going to happen.

Q: They think they'll find out some secret?

A: It's a very fundamental idea.

Q: Explain.

A: You search through the jungle for the lost fountain of youth, and you hack away overgrowth and you endure bugs and snakes and all sorts of unpleasantness—trying your best to exert your own will power toward that fabled goal—and then what? Then, when you finally find the fountain, you surrender to it. You drink and bathe in the water and you let it do its work on you.

Q: And that's like being hypnotized?

A: You're looking for something to override your normal will power, your normal processes, your normal drive to go get what you want. People want Ultimate Experiences or Illuminations, and they believe these revelations will come as a result of their surrendering the whole shooting match to something else. Rather than treating this human tendency as perfectly normal and natural, I treated it as a kind of marvel to be examined and rolled around and examined from all sides. Take the example of an amusement park. You see people throwing baseballs at lead

bowling pins to win a stuffed bear, but the most popular events are the rides like the giant roller coaster—because they take you over at some point, they make you surrender your “normal” state of mind to a “revelation”—that of being thrown into, forced into, another reality, a so-called special reality where your normal perception is shoved into the background.

In the early days, when I was learning about how to hypnotize people, I found that I was very good at it, because I was utterly convinced that people wanted to be put in a trance. They were lining up to surrender their will power. I knew that in my bones. And so I instinctively found a way to give them exactly what they wanted. I never felt I was breaking some internal rule they were living by. The deeper rule was: Do me; hypnotize me; take away my will.

Q: It was a kind of pleasure for them.

A: To be taken over.

Q: “Let the sound of the ocean roll over me, and let the sun beat down on me.” What’s wrong with that?

A: Well, in my early days, I didn’t think there was anything wrong with it. I was just cooperating with what I considered was the Deeper Law.

Q: How far did you take that?

A: In some cases, all the way. If a person wanted a new outlook on life, an outlook that he thought was better than anything he could manufacture himself, I was there to give it to him. That was my job. To turn things inside out and install a better, more positive theme to his life.

Q: And you were okay with that?

A: For a time. I refused to think there was anything better. For example, I was treating a kleptomaniac, a woman who couldn’t stop stealing. She told me she had tried everything to stop, but nothing worked. So I dove in and tried to give her a new outlook, an outlook that didn’t require her to steal. I tried to give her a better state of mind in wholesale form, by making suggestions over a long period of time while she was under, while she was in a trance.

Q: How did that work out?

A: She loved the short periods when she was under, when she let go of her own will power. It was like a vacation for her. But eventually the whole thing collapsed of its own weight and she was back to square one.

Q: What did you conclude about why your effort collapsed?

A: First, I assumed that I hadn’t done the actual hypnosis well enough. That was silly. I had done it well. Then I decided that I had failed because I hadn’t ATTACHED

this new outlook I was “installing” to some key part of her personality. The “imported new personality” had no foundation; it just floated in the sea of her mind like an island, and eventually it was overwhelmed by her stronger impulses. I assumed my attempt at mind control wasn’t reaching deep enough roots in her. That’s when I went back and re-studied all the information on CIA mind control.

Q: From a new perspective.

A: Yes. Because I had to admit I was doing mind control, pure and simple. I had to admit that.

Q: It didn’t make you happy.

A: Not at all.

Q: So what did you see when you reviewed the CIA data again?

A: The obvious, I guess. They were working from duress. They were attaching their suggestions to their “patients” by forcing them to surrender their own personalities, at which point they tried, in a sense, to install new personalities.

Q: Talk more about the whole idea that a person wants to surrender his will in order to find some Ultimate Thing.

A: The sense that a person wants to surrender his will at all—where does that come from? It comes from past experiences where he taught himself—or others taught him—that will power is frustrating and doesn’t get you where you want to go in life. So he looks for another way out and he selects THE SURRENDER OF THE WILL. There are many places in the culture he finds that teaching.

Q: How did you feel when you came to this conclusion?

A: First depressed, then elated.

Q: Why elated?

A: Because it became apparent to me that a person could, on his own, without the mind control factor, INVENT his own outlook on life and thereby reach his goals. And hypnotism, if it were going to do any good at all, would have to somehow participate in that journey.

Q: When you say “invent his own outlook”—

A: I don’t mean blot out the past and become a smiling robot with a Plan. I don’t mean some horribly grotesque smiling mask of “positive thinking.” I mean something much richer and fuller.

Q: How can hypnotism assist a person in this work, if hypnotism is all about getting a person to surrender his will and accept suggestions from the therapist?

A: That was the question. I was elated because it was a very stark question, and it framed my future work. Things may not have been solved for me, but they were suddenly clear, for the first time. My job was to take a "science" that was really all about surrender and use it for the opposite purpose. My job was to make hypnotism into a thing that could make the will more powerful. My job was to help people create at a deeper level for themselves. On the surface, it seemed like this task would be impossible. But that was just fine with me. I've always enjoyed paradox. I felt at home with paradox. Give me a saw and tell me I have to find a way to paint pictures with it, and I'm happy.

Speaking of which, you paint, so let's use that. Let's say you really want to do a huge painting, a fresco that spans a whole wall. That's your major idea. So how do you get there? You may, while you're asleep, dream of some of the images, but you're going to have to get on the ladder and PAINT. And keep painting until you say, that's it, and then you stop.

If you keep on creating long enough, creating in the direction of what is most important for you, you'll also learn about CREATION ITSELF. See? Creating is will power that has found its home. That's where will power really wants to be. CREATING. The more you create, the more you're moving into it, you're immersed in it, and you're becoming more satisfied.

Q: "Only the gods really create."

A: Yeah. That's a major piece of mind control.

Q: And if we go the other way? If we just keep creating?

A: We become what we really are. I worked out ways to use hypnotism to stimulate the creative urge in people. As a kick start. Imagine a fictional ant colony. On the lowest level, the ants just follow their orders, so to speak. They do exactly what is expected of them and nothing more. No deviation. Now, a few of the ants graduate from there to realizing that following orders has the flavor of, let's call it, doing the right thing. They're following orders, but they also realize they're doing the right thing. Then, out of that small group, a few ants begin to see that they're creating. They're creating their own actions—and at that point, they veer off. They don't follow orders anymore. They think about what they really want to create. And then THAT'S what they create. And they feel they're on a whole new level. And they are.

Q: At which point, the whole ant colony could begin to disintegrate.

A: Don't blame me.

Q: But you think this disintegration is a good thing.

A: Disintegration of a perfect system that makes more and more obedient ants? Yes.

Q: On a political level—

A: I'm talking about healthy disintegration, which is really decentralization of power.

Q: Many people would say we all need to act in concert to preserve civilization.

A: Concert is not necessarily the same thing as obedience. But let's not split hairs. If you want to be an ant, go right ahead. You'll always have a place. As long as you surrender your own will long enough.

Q: As times get tougher, more people look for a way to become ants.

A: Yes they do. And this is what they call "preservation of civilization." The whole question is, what do you mean by CIVILIZATION? Do you mean a billion people acting on orders from an elite? Ants always drift toward the absolute Collective.

Q: Are you taking a cruel position here?

A: Not at all. Cruel is getting people to surrender their will to create. Cruel is getting people to think they must create in the mode of the All.

Q: What's the All?

A: The fiction that we are really constrained to making our little part of the anthill and that's it. And the fiction that there is a wider purpose and entity behind this, and it's running the whole show, and we have to surrender to THAT.

Q: And what is the opposite?

A: What each person can find by flying over the anthill.

Q: That's a whole different picture of what society would become.

A: Yeah.

Q: In this picture, what is the glue that holds things together?

A: The glue is what we always said it was. You can't use your freedom to curtail the freedom of another. We always said that, but we didn't really mean it.

Q: Suppose a person wants to create something shallow and stupid.

A: Then by creating it and getting it he stands a chance of discovering it's shallow and stupid, whereas if he just hopes for it and wishes for it and whines about it, he has NO chance of finding out it's shallow and stupid.

Q: Suppose he creates it and finds out it's stupid. What does he do then?

A: Figures out something else he wants. And then creates whatever he has to create to get that.

Q: And if THAT turns out to be shallow and stupid?

A: Repeat step A and B over and over until he decides he's creating something that isn't stupid.

Q: And in this process he finds out something about creation itself.

A: That's the bonus. And the bonus becomes the main event, eventually.

Q: How so?

A: You take a special horse that is very dumb. And you think, this horse is so dumb I have to lock him in the stall and leave him there, because he doesn't know what to do with himself. Will that work? Of course not. So instead, you let the horse out of the stall. The dumb horse is now free to create. So the first thing he does is, he eats 12 bales of hay. He vomits it up. Then he eats 12 more bales and pukes again. Then he walks around in a circle for three weeks and falls down. Then he walks in a straight line toward the horizon because he thinks that's where he wants to go. But he gets tired and lies down and goes to sleep. You see? He keeps creating dumb things. But finally, after three years, he decides to try running. And discovers he loves to run. THIS is really what he wants. He's not dumb anymore. So he runs and runs, and in the process he realizes that he's CREATING. And a light bulb goes on in his head. Now he is doing more than running. He is somehow more than he was. And eventually, by this process he learns to fly, and you've got Pegasus. (laughs)

Q: Okay. Suppose the first time you let this dumb horse out of the stall you force him to run. Won't he get where he wants to be faster?

A: He might. But chances are he's too dumb at that point to realize that running is what he wants. So he keeps stopping. He didn't go through the process himself.

Q: Do you think there is a limit on what a person can create?

A: No.

Q: He can create gold bars out of thin air?

A: Yes.

Q: You really mean that?

A: Yes.

Q: How does a person create gold bars out of thin air?

A: I'll tell you this. He doesn't do it the first time he's let out of the stall. It might take a million incarnations. Depends on who he is.

Q: What about a person who creates crime, murder?

A: The principle of freedom applies. You are free to create anything that doesn't curtail the freedom of another person. If a person commits murder, you lock him up or you execute him.

Q: If a person knowingly creates 50,000 tons of toxic chemicals as the head of a huge corporation that he has built?

A: You lock him up. And you make him pay for the cleanup. I say lock him up for a long time.

Q: But then you are limiting his ability to create.

A: I sure as hell hope so.

Q: Do you believe a person can create his way out of the space-time continuum? If he wants to?

A: Of course.

Q: What gave you the idea that individual creativity has such great potential power?

A: Many, many clues. For example, in my own practice, I saw patients who were able to do extraordinary things, if only briefly. A patient moved an object on a table without touching it. Another patient blew out a light bulb in my office. By "looking at it." He did this twice. These are the very little things. There are other events and experiences. But it doesn't matter what I've seen. It only matters what other people believe and do.

When I put someone in a light trance, what I'm dealing with is a person who, for the moment, is free from a whole host of suggestions that otherwise would be guiding his opinions and perceptions. It's an interesting moment. What should I do? Just give him more suggestions? He already has too many of those in his waking life.

I have that person create reality. I have him invent a dream or construct a scene, any scene. Something. Anything.

Q: But that would seem to be the opposite of discovering what reality is.

A: The situation is very fluid, my friend. Reality is malleable. That is what I learned from my patients. Reality isn't just one thing, like a present you unwrap.

Q: That's like saying you have to tell lies to arrive at the truth.

A: You're a little off base there. But I'll go along with it. In which case, the whole point is these are YOUR lies. You fumble around and create lies or whatever you want to call them. And in the process you arrive at the truth, somewhere down the line.

I'll give you a patient summary. Man of about 35 comes into my office and tells me he's bothered by his marriage. Things are not working out. He wants to find the right formula, but he can't. No matter what he does, he feels a lack. He feels he's screwing it up. He tries to do all the right things, but nothing good comes out of it. He just gets himself into more hot water.

Q: He's confused.

A: And this is good, because otherwise he never would be making the effort to make things come out right. So I put him into a light trance. I then get him to INVENT scenes and dreams. All sorts of scenes.

Q: And this helps him how?

A: He begins to expand his own ideas about what reality can be. And once he does that, he begins to get a kind of feedback from his own inventions. He tends to drop his fixation on fixing his own marriage. You see, "his own marriage" is a more or less a fixed "non-idea" that traps him into thinking that he is tinkering with one thing that needs the right part inserted—like a car that won't run.

Q: Whereas?

A: His current marriage is a lowest common denominator that he derives from vague images. He is laboring under the delusion that his current marriage is one very real thing, like an object inside a vacuum jar.

Q: But it isn't.

A: Correct. It's a congealed derivation. For, example, we look at a table and think it's one thing that has a set number of uses. But then an artist comes along and takes that table and paints it and cuts it up and re-glues it and it's something else entirely.

When I had this patient invent all sorts of scenes and dreams, he began to see that his marriage was just one outcome of his own sense of reality. He was living inside a trap. The trap didn't need tinkering. It needed something else introduced from the outside. And "the outside" is his own imagination.

Q: So, suppose his marriage was suffering because he was insisting that his wife should do x,y,z when she didn't want to.

A: And suppose I then say, "Look, all you have to do is stop insisting she do x,y,z."

Q: And he follows your advice.

A: And then something else will crop up. Some other problem. Forever, over and over. Because he is living inside a trap. A trap he made. But he doesn't see this. And even if he and I completely dismantle that marriage into "parts" and I make him examine each one, that process isn't going to fix it. It's like a physicist who is trying to gain a new understanding of life itself. He keeps breaking down particles into

smaller and smaller particles. And nothing happens. Because he's in the wrong pew to begin with.

Well, that's the way it works with reality itself. Reality is not one thing like a car. Reality, the ordinary boring repetitious version, is WHAT WE ARE LEFT WITH WHEN WE STOP CREATING REALITIES. And how do you fix THAT problem? By tinkering with the sludge you're left with? No.

Q: How does this connect to the whole subject of the master-slave relationship?

A: A slave has one reality, which is formed by his abandonment of the process of creating realities.

Q: Therefore, anything that will make him stop creating realities functions as a way of making him a slave.

A: Yes, that's right.

Q: And you came to this in your work?

A: I sure as hell did. You see, one of the basic problems is the drive for perfection. Nothing is perfect. To want perfection is to want that leftover sludge called reality. You fuss with that sludge and you try to even out the corners and paint it pink and fix the edges and so forth. But you lose. Because you can't get perfection out of something that is a residue to begin with. I've had many patients who wanted to change their lives by fixing a losing proposition—a bad house that was sinking in its foundations, so to speak, and the person wanted to replace shingles on the roof and bring in a new carpet.

Q: Where does that drive for perfection come from in the first place?

A: It comes from the sense that the reality you are dealing with is the only one that exists, and therefore you must make it as obsessively good as you possibly can. That perfectionism is based on a basic insecurity, because, deep down, the person knows that he is working with a lie. One and only one reality is a lie. A reality that is GIVEN is a lie. Realities are created.

Q: Even in terms of the cosmos itself—

A: We are working with a lie. There are an infinite number of possible cosmos-es. Let's say I have a patient who can respond to the idea of creating a brand new cosmos. He can do that. He does do that.

Q: In his mind.

A: Right. And over the course of a year or two, he creates five thousand more. What'll happen? He'll begin to get a whole new sense of what is possible. I did have just such a patient. He had come to me because of a personal crisis in faith. After we finished, he no longer felt he needed to "fix" his current metaphysical belief system.

He saw that as a foolish enterprise. He graduated from being a tinkerer to being a full-blooded adventurer. In the process, he became quite a good remote viewer. That was just a byproduct. We weren't aiming for that.

Q: When you were approached by these "government contractors" to work with them, was this subject brought up in any form?

A: Remote viewing? Yes.

Q: Specifically?

A: For example, being able to see what people were doing in other distant locations.

Q: You had had success with that?

A: Again, as a byproduct. I was never shooting for it. I had patients who, for periods of time, were able to obtain very clear views of what was happening at long distances. I confirmed this, in experiments.

Q: How were these patients able to find this ability?

A: All I was doing was having the patients create all sorts of distant imaginary locations and describe what they had created.

Q: Describe what they had CREATED.

A: Yes. And then, once in awhile, they would say, "Well, I just came across a place, I didn't really invent this one, it's a hotel room in Canton, Ohio, and there are two people sitting there talking about a sale they made that day. Here is what they're talking about. Blah blah."

Q: They stumbled across that one.

A: Yes. As if it was a piece of fall-out from the process of inventing.

Q: That must have blown you away.

A: It blew me away when I got to the point where I was able to get a patient to do that on purpose, and I was able to confirm what they were reporting was actually happening—I did that in a staged experiment.

Q: And—

A: And after awhile I got bored with it. I was more interested in the whole process of inventing. That was the key. That was the whole deal: inventing realities.

You see, the government and military types are like the person who thinks that higher abilities are basically all about the technique of "extra-special seeing." Whereas inventing and creating are integral and top-dog aspects of the whole process. They couldn't have understood that if I had explained it to them. Because

they are all about “tinkering.” That’s their obsession. And that’s why they want to control reality and people. Because they see reality as something that must be gone over and over with all that tinkering to make it perfect.

Q: Why?

A: Because of a paradox. They tell and invent lies all the time, they keep creating sub-realities all the time, and yet they don’t realize that THIS is how you find out what reality is. They don’t see the higher aspect. They just think that by inventing all these lies and cover stories and enemies, they’ll be able to control the one and only reality. It’s hysterically stupid.

Q: You once had a patient who started looking at the underlying structure of a bottle of water on a table.

A: He got down to a level below or beyond the so-called sub-atomic layer of the water in the bottle, and reported a blue energy that was, as he put it, “the real stuff.” The electrons and the quarks and so on, he said, were a construct invoked by us to explain and predict the motion of matter.

I and a few other researchers subsequently put this patient to work trying to change the arrangement of still water in a jar. Using sensitive instruments, we were able to show that, with his mind alone, he could change the arrangement.

Q: Have you ever hypnotized a person and had him reveal the guts of his own mental programming?

A: It’s happened, but I don’t put much stock in it.

Q: Why not?

A: Because a person under hypnosis is liable to say anything. I know that doesn’t sound very technical or clinical, but it’s the truth. What I mean is, the patient picks up cues from the hypnotist. If the patient senses the hypnotist wants him to do something, he will.

Q: So if a patient thought you wanted him to reveal the nature of his own conditioning, he would give that to you.

A: He’d invent it.

Q: Really.

A: Yes. Now, understand, I’m not talking about a patient who was subjected to actual traumatic mind control in the past. I’m talking about your average Joe. Joe would invent something. He might create a whole structure of “programming.” Which says a great deal about the creative ability of an individual.

Most people—and I still find this amazing—believe that they can feel and see only certain things. Everything else doesn’t exist.

Q: You mean people don't believe in the paranormal?

A: Let's not use that word. It's deceptive in this situation. No, what I mean is this. People believe they feel and see within a range. That's the "human spectrum." "I can see what I see and feel what I feel." And that's where all the trouble starts. You understand?

Q: I'm not sure.

A: People unconsciously establish those limits. They feel comfortable in that defined space. They live their lives and they suffer and they make small victories in that space, where they feel A, B, C, D, and E, and they see within a certain range. This is very important. I encounter it all the time with patients. This is their disease. They don't know it. They want to find a solution to their problems within that space—they don't understand that the problem IS that space.

Q: The limited space of seeing and feeling is the problem.

A: All the frustration grows from that. It's the unconsciously assumed boundary of life. What a person assumes he can feel and see forms a space—a set of boundaries for experience. When you've got that operating, you're going to have many problems and contradictions. You're going to come up against impossible situations, and you're going to eventually accept "your fate" and knuckle under and give in. You're going to construct a myth that rationalizes your very limited life.

Q: Why do people do this to themselves?

A: There are many answers to that question, but let's use this one: people feel an obligation to copy each other. It's a bizarre concept, but it's true. People tend to sink to each other's lowest common denominator.

It's how you form a group. You have an unconscious consensus: "I'll be like you and you'll be like me." So everybody keeps sinking down a little to copy each other. And this pattern and impulse gets programmed in. It becomes the guide.

Q: But then you have people who have broken free of that. And still they don't really want to create something major.

A: Yes, but let's stick with this for a moment. What does "breaking free" mean? Does it mean widening the boundaries of what you can see and feel, or does it just mean getting fed up with other people's blindness? There is a difference.

Let's look at the programming. Suppose a person is self-programmed to see 500 different things and feel in 12 different ways. I'm simplifying, of course. But suppose that's the case. What's going to happen? A treadmill effect is going to happen. A person, over 40 years of living or so, is going to see those 500 different things and feel those 12 feelings, over and over. He's going to repeat and repeat. He's going to get used to that. He's going to get bored, whether he admits it or not.

And that boredom is going to have a corrosive effect. He's probably going to call that effect "growing older." But it isn't. Not really.

Q: And then?

A: That's where the creative aspect could come in. If, for example, he really begins to create a new future that is ambitious and big and adventurous, he will feel and see new things. That will happen. But he's programmed himself not to feel and see new things. He's programmed himself to believe that he can't feel and see those new things. So what does he do? He stalls. He stops himself. He doesn't create. He doesn't do it.

For years, I was concerned with eliminating all that programming. I wanted patients to see and feel new things. I wanted to dismantle their old pattern. But then I realized it wasn't about what they could or couldn't see. It wasn't really about that. It was about whether they would or wouldn't create. That was the crux. That was the question.

Q: You can't just remove the programming.

A: You can't take it out like an old recording. You can't do surgery on it. The person will turn around put the same record right back on the turntable. People love to believe they are being deprogrammed. They love that idea. You can sell that idea from here to the moon. They love it. And why? Because it doesn't require them to do anything. They can "have it done to them." That's what they think. But then—they'll put all the programming back, later on. It's a joke. It's a con game. They're conning me and they're conning themselves.

Q: You've seen that?

A: Every day. It's the same reason people love spiritual systems. They can do a discipline, but they don't really have to create. They think they're getting somewhere, but they still haven't crossed the line. I've worked with people who'll do ANYTHING to avoid creating. They'll fast and run and pray and meditate and exercise and change diets and detox and go to retreats and bond and form communities and get into isolation tanks and climb mountains and....the one thing they won't do is CREATE.

Q: What do they equate creating with?

A: The death of what they are supposed to feel and see. People can only break through by creating new experience. When they create THAT, they know they are breaking free.

Q: And yet the culture does no more than pay lip service to creating.

A: What else would you expect? You've been painting for a long time. What did you discover?

Q: That I wanted to keep on doing it. That everything changed when I painted.

A: That's what I mean. That was your avenue. Painting was your exit.

Q: What are your impressions about what's happening to human beings at the end of the twentieth century?

A: Well, the centers of cognition in the mind are getting stretched out and thinned out and in many cases they are becoming almost useless. People can't follow a train of thought. So how are you going to approach them with ideas that require some real consideration?

Q: Why is this happening?

A: Many reasons. But I focus on centers.

Q: What kinds of centers?

A: In the mind, of course. That's where the drama is being played out. There are pleasure centers and centers of thought, and centers of feeling, and so on.

Q: And these "boxes" are why people are frustrated with the reality they live in every day?

A: There is the brain. Maybe that's what you mean.

Q: The brain?

A: Are you using your brain right now?

Q: Sure.

A: How do you know you're using your brain? Can you feel it? Can you feel it turning out thoughts? For all you know, your brain might be a 1957 Chevy engine. How could you tell?

Q: I believe some researchers have worked it out.

A: Is that right? Well, they haven't. I prefer to listen to my clients tell me about their brains while they're under hypnosis. Then you get some really good information.

Q: You hypnotize people and ask them about their brains?

A: Absolutely. I want to know what they think about the brain. Do you know why? Because everybody has a kind of awe about the brain. It's like some sort of religious symbol. There is a religion of the brain.

Q: Where is their church headquarters?

A: Spread out in brain-research facilities all over the world. And their goal is to make androids. People who react to signals and feel happy.

Q: Brave New World.

A: I'd call it Cowardly New World. Pavlov is their number-one saint. A colleague of mine once told me a joke about that. A dog attacked Pavlov and killed him. The dog got angry. He didn't like listening to that bell that told him food was coming. The dog wanted to find his own food, and he finally exploded and killed his master. I can tell you this. If they succeed in making a Brave New World, it'll never last. The population will rebel and destroy every society in the world. They'll level every government and every army....take, for example, pleasure centers in the brain.

That's how classical hypnosis works. You reach in and stimulate a pleasure center. That's the beginning and the end of old-time old-school hypnosis. That's what's going on.

You put people in trance by stimulating a pleasure center. When people feel pleasure, they go along with you. They agree with you. They think you've got something to offer. They want to be your friend.

I once hypnotized a man and told him to look at his brain and tell me how many pleasure centers he had. He said, "Three." That was his answer. That's what he saw. I told him to go to the first one and tell me what was in there. He said, "It's like a doorway. It's a symbol of a door to a magic land."

I took him at his word. So I said, "Walk through the door." And he did. He said, "I'm in a place where I take good orders." That was interesting. So I gave him an order. I said, "You feel wealthy. You feel rich." And you know what happened?

Q: No.

A: He smiled. Big smile. Goofy smile. Like he was on a drug. I had him hooked up to a monitor. And I saw that his blood pressure came right down. He had high blood pressure. And it came right down, in about a minute, into the normal range. Just like that.

Q: And he was happy.

A: Right. So then I had a little problem.

Q: You got his blood pressure down, but to do it you put him in a place where he was compliant—

A: He was an android. Taking orders. He was operating like a biological machine. Under external control. His consciousness was focused on a pleasure center, or what he believed was a pleasure center, in his own brain. Get it?

Q: Yeah. So you didn't want to leave him there.

A: I brought back out, and within thirty minutes his blood pressure was back up again. Just like that.

Q: How about this? Every week, you keep putting him under for a few minutes. You direct him to that pleasure center, and you give him the same order: "You feel you're rich." You condition him to expect that pleasure, and so his blood pressure comes down. Permanently.

A: Doesn't work. The blood pressure comes down, but it doesn't stay down. And after several sessions, it doesn't come down at all, even while he's in the pleasure center.

Q: Why not?

A: Because something else takes over. He knows I'm tricking him. He knows it's a game. He wouldn't respond in the same way. That's the first reason. The second reason it didn't work is much more important. He got bored.

Q: Bored?

A: People get bored with pleasure. Of course, every advertising agency knows that. That's why they keep shifting their ads. And that's why companies keep "improving" their products. They're reaching out beyond the last wave of boredom, and they're trying to find a new place in a pleasure center.

Q: Seems to be working.

A: I have my doubts. I think we're reaching the end of the line.

Q: What do you mean?

A: We're reaching a point where people are going to stop buying things at the same rate they're buying them now. The curve is disintegrating. Slowly. It's happening. The consumer is getting wise to the tricks. His boredom is spreading. The boredom is outreaching and outdistancing the attempts to stimulate his pleasure centers.

Q: Boredom.

A: Big thing, my friend. But you see, we have to back up and look at what I'm talking about here. All this stuff concerns what happens when people are being manipulated. That's the primary factor. All this has to do with a form of hypnotism I don't practice anymore. In which the person is too much under the control of someone else. In that setting, you can tap into pleasure centers and you can release certain chemicals, and you can give birth to all sorts of effects in the body. You can do that. But it's within the context of external control.

Q: Even if you took something like levitation—

A: All right. Lets consider that. Extraordinary effects. Let's say I put someone in a major trance and I have him tap into a place where he feels there is a pleasure

center. That's what the patient believes, and so it works. That's all you need. And then I tell him to levitate off the floor. And let's say for a moment my order overrides whatever he might think about levitation, about how it's impossible and so on. And so he DOES rise up off the floor two feet and he hovers there. See? What do we have? An extraordinary situation. The suspension of the law of gravitation. We see that a person has THAT LAW INSIDE HIMSELF. HE'S THE ONE WHO IS MAKING THE LAW OF GRAVITATION, AND NOW HE'S SUSPENDING IT. HE'S LEVITATING.

Q: But he's doing it—

A: He's doing it under my control. That's the key. We've got a hell of a situation then. This guy is suspending the law of gravitation, he's floating in the air, he's doing what people thought was impossible, and yet he's doing it because I'm doing this little trick. I'm working with his own sense of pleasure. That's why it's happening. It's not happening for any other reason.

Q: So what do you do?

A: There's nothing I really can do.

Q: Why not?

A: Because the law of his own freedom and choice is a higher law than him floating in the middle of the room. I make that distinction. I don't suddenly say, "The hell with this guy's freedom of choice, he's levitating!" I don't get sucked into extraordinary effects. I don't abandon everything I think is right.

Q: But levitation is possible.

A: But he has to do it himself. He has to want to do it while he's in an alert state. He has to make the choice. And then he has to figure out how to do it.

Q: But where does the boredom factor come in?

A: It comes in, in a lot of places. For instance, when he's tried to levitate on his own a hundred times and he doesn't do it. Then he says, "I'm bored." Then he stays right where he is in his life. Then he gives up. Then he yawns and turns on the TV. And THAT BOREDOM AND THAT SURRENDER IS THE REALITY YOU WERE TALKING ABOUT. THAT'S ALL IT IS. THAT'S HOW IT WORKS. HOW IT HAPPENS. People give up, but they give up in a rather extraordinary way. They try something extraordinary and then they think they've failed forever, and then they decide it's impossible, and then they go back to being consumers and so on.

Q: And then they come to see you as patients.

A: (laughs) Right. That's exactly how it happens. People try to do extraordinary things in their lives, and then they give up, and then they search around for help. And they come to a person like me, because they think I'll be able to do it for them.

I'll be able to tap into their pleasure centers. I'll be able to direct them. And I can. I can get people to do all sorts of things. But what about when I stop?

Q: So you need to teach them how to tap into their own pleasure centers.

A: It's limited. It only works for a while. A pleasure center shifts. It doesn't stay the same. It wears out. The boredom takes over. It's like, to use a gross example, porn. Most people, if they watch porn, get bored with it after awhile. And the people who don't get bored are really miserable, because they're desperately trying to eke out one more millimeter of pleasure from it, and it takes monumental effort just to get that one more millimeter. There are diminishing returns.

Q: Pleasure centers shift and wear out.

A: Yeah. These centers are not really in the brain. They're in the consciousness, which is different. Pleasure centers, the more powerful ones, are in energy fields. Let me tell you about another experiment I once did. This one was really funny and very wild. I hypnotized a man and had him tell me about his pleasure centers. This guy was rich, and he was a shopping addict. He bought stuff every day of his life. He went all over the country buying things and bidding at auctions. Anyway, he found a pleasure center he said had to do with owning things. That was the way he put it, more or less. And when I had him describe that pleasure center, he told me it was like the pitted and blackened hull of an old moon. It had been burned. It was wasted. It had no life on it. It was very grim.

Q: So he was beyond bored with himself.

A: Correct. He was trying to squeeze every drop of pleasure possible out of owning things, and he was dying from it. His mind was like a cinder after a forest fire. That's all he had left.

These centers shift, as I said. They move around and die out. But why are they there in the first place? Because the person put them there. That's how it happens. And why does he put them there? Because he's looking for a way to be an android. See? That's what's happening.

A person decides he can do relatively little himself. So he decides that if he creates pleasure centers, then other people will be able to control him through those pleasure centers, and in controlling him, they'll be able to get him to do things he can't do himself. I know it sounds crazy, but that's the way it works. And that's really the definition of an android.

Q: That's a mouthful.

A: I had a patient in a trance, and I asked him to locate a pleasure center, and he did, and then I asked him to sketch me a history of that pleasure center. And you know what? He took it all the way back to a previous lifetime on a different planet. I'm just giving you what he told me. He had been a soldier in an army, and he quit

and he went to live in some kind of hedonistic settlement, and he began to do various styles of meditation, and he began to invent—INVENT—a part of his mind that hadn't existed before. It was a pleasure center, and he hoped it would become something that could be tapped into by other people, who would use it to get him to the place we would call Nirvana.

Q: That's what he said?

A: Yes. I'll ask patients anything. I'll ask them for information everyone else says is impossible or non-existent. But I assume a patient can tell me anything. He can go anywhere and give me HIS answers to anything.

Q: So you say this pleasure-center situation leads to being an android.

A: Yes, a person waiting to take orders. And that person hopes the orders will catapult him to a higher state, or a state that "fulfills his best function." You see? That's an android. An android wants an operator. An outside operator. And an android wants to fulfill his own best function. An android believes he's designed to achieve a best function. And he believes that, in order to do that, he needs an outside operator.

Q: A controller.

A: Yes.

Q: So all this amounts to serious brainwashing.

A: You saw the Ridley Scott film, Blade Runner?

Q: Yeah.

A: Well, he introduced this little extra factor, that the androids, one or two of whom were pleasure models, knew they had been created with limited functions, and they were rather sad about it.

Q: And that's one vision of the future.

A: That's where brain science really wants to take this society.

Let's say you've got two people who are married. They love each other. And they see lots of common ground. They think their future is going to be a piece of cake. But it doesn't turn out that way. Because they are coming under pressure. The convenient similarities are cracking apart. As the years pass, despite their best efforts, they are drifting apart. What at first seemed like "two peas in a pod"—that's disintegrating. Why? Because a truth is being exposed. These two people are quite different. The immediate sameness? That was a fiction, in many respects. That was a story they told themselves. It worked for a time, but then it doesn't work anymore. When they got married, there was a certain android aspect to the whole thing. Two people stimulating each other's pleasure centers. Two peas in a pod. I'm

not saying that was the whole basis for their relationship, because it wasn't. But it was there. And now it's not. The pleasure centers have shifted and changed and worn out, the boredom factor has set in, and stimulation from the pleasure centers is harder to get. It isn't so easy anymore. And when that android formula doesn't work, what are they going to do? Are they going to fold up under pressure? Are they going to drift further and further apart? If they get out from under their androidal fixations, they'll see that their differences can be foundations for one of the best things they've got. They can build much better connections on those differences.

People, under their own radar—hiding it from themselves—swear allegiance to a pleasure principle—they see that as a valuable goal. And they create these pleasure centers for themselves in their minds—and they wait for someone to come along and zing that pleasure center—and then they define that zing feeling as love or bliss or ecstasy or Nirvana or whatever. You see? This activity is going on below the surface in many people. You don't see it. But you see the effects of it. And as a result, all these people begin to resemble each other more and more. And they can be controlled en masse, from the outside, by advertising and gossip and TV and sugar and junk food and certain religious and spiritual and political sentiments. All based on that pinging and zinging of the pleasure centers. And believe me, I'm not against pleasure. I'm for it. But not particularly in those pleasure centers, and not to the exclusion of everything else. So as millions and millions of people become more like each other—by this process—you get a strange effect. They are all more or less living inside the same pleasure bubble, and that bubble becomes their space. That's how they really define their space. That's where they ARE. And THEN, within that space, they begin to look around and figure out what's going on.

Q: They're already inside the bubble.

A: And the real job is to get outside the bubble. Because, outside, there are levels of pleasure that far surpass what's happening inside. The pleasure outside is far different and far more thrilling and far more rewarding. And it's not androidal. People outside the bubble are not waiting for the zing to come in from an operator. That's not how it works.

Q: How does it work?

A: IMAGINATION—CREATION—ACTION. That's the superior sequence.

Q: And where does love come in?

A: It's a more robust form of love outside the bubble. It has more dimensions. It has more staying power. It doesn't depend on shifts of pleasure centers and boredom.

Q: Suppose, in a relationship, you have a person outside the bubble and a person inside the bubble?

A: If it stays that way, you've got a formula for misery.

Q: It would seem that when a person creates these pleasure centers, he's profoundly surrendering. He doesn't see any other future.

A: But sometimes a person will do it just for a kick. He wants a new experience. He doesn't call it BEING A SLAVE TO PLEASURE, but he eventually will get into that space, that bubble. He's moving more toward becoming an android. But there is always a leakage. A leakage of creative energy—his own energy—coming in. And if he can identify that, he can do something.

Q: Suppose you get a society where most of the people have become androids. Suppose that happens.

A: Then they are all in the bubble. They seek pleasure only at that level, and they're stimulated by pleasure at that level. Then all hell breaks loose.

Q: Why?

A: Because the boredom sets in faster. It's transmitted telepathically from person to person. The pleasure centers wear out faster. At that point, the frustration collectively builds up and explodes.

Q: Which leads to?

A: The operators use more and more drastic measures to keep people in the bubble. More invasive means. But that automatically cuts down the pleasure sensation. Law of diminishing returns.

Q: And the operators? What space are they in?

A: Ultimately? Dead space. That's what makes them operators. They just sit there in a kind of vacuum. They're the living dead. They get their only pleasure from operating the androids. And that, too, has diminishing returns. That leads these controllers to exert more force on the androids. The whole thing collapses. Like an exploding star.

I once asked a patient to describe the collapse. I won't bother to describe how we got to that point in our work. She was a very bright woman and I had worked with her for a year or so. She said the collapse was like an amusement park ride that had gone off the rails, and everyone was thrown out. Centrifugal force. An end point. She also said the androids had been aiming for that, because they couldn't see any other route of escape. This is pretty much why societies are based on war. War is the thing people think will wake them up and get them out of the bubble.

Q: Does it?

A: Temporarily. But then they sink back.

Q: So you say there is a higher sequence. IMAGINATION—CREATION—ACTION.

A: It's self-initiated. It's a whole different space. It's forceful. Many people are afraid of it, because they associate powerful action with doing harm. That's a lie. That's conditioning. That's a piece of bullshit they learn. That's why they go for "restful" and "peaceful" spiritual systems. They float up to that ceiling where they've been taught they're "too elevated," where they might then do harm to others, and they bounce off that ceiling, and they come down into the bubble, and then they get that glazed and "peaceful" look. They sometimes try to go for a pastel Nirvana. It never works.

[At one point in his work, one of Jack's favorite questions, with patients, was:
"WHAT IS THE UNDERLYING BASIS OF REALITY?"---JR]

Q: Why did you, at one time, like that REALITY question so much?

A: Because it cuts through a lot of nonsense. I'm only interested in the patient's version of how reality is formed. I'm not trying to impose my own view.

Q: What kinds of answers do you get?

A: They evolve. They sometimes start with a religious format, and then that changes.

Q: Why does that change?

A: Because I allow the patient to keep searching. I don't cut him short. I let the sessions go on.

Q: Are you hoping to get a final answer from a patient?

A: No. I know, from experience, that as the patient changes his answers, HE changes.

Q: Changes how?

A: He becomes more strong, more confident.

Q: And this is because?

A: He's getting through layers of weaker answers into layers of stronger answers, answers that mean more to him. He's on a voyage, and he becomes more confident in navigating by the seat of his pants.

Q: Why do those weaker answers exist?

A: They're compromises. The person has opted for more and more conventional answers. He became less confident in answering the question to his own satisfaction.

Q: And systems play into this?

A: The more conventional answers are part of some system.

Q: So it would be like a painter who moves further and further into the orbit of copying some style, as opposed to painting what he wants to.

A: Sure. Yes. And the thing about a system is, you have to assert it with more force to give it credence TO YOURSELF. You have to keep pushing it. That looks like confidence, but it isn't. It's a substitute. And the person falling into the trap experiences a slippage, this gap between what he really would think and what he comes to accept as real.

Q: In your work with patients, do you care whether the person is telling you what he thinks the underlying basis of reality is or whether he is imagining it, is making it up?

A: No. I don't care at all. And I don't try to differentiate that. I just plow ahead. It all comes out in the wash. Because I'm working with a basic confusion in the patient. He's lost the thread. He isn't sure when he's accepting something or inferring something or making up something. He doesn't sort that out. But he will, given time. He does. And it's a beautiful thing to see when it happens. It's like the person comes walking out of a swamp with a big grin on his face.

Q: Why does imagination get the short end of the stick?

A: Because we're operating inside a consensus. It's ever-present. Consensus is mostly a sign of fear. It's what you opt for when you think you've got no place else to go. Let me put it this way. The best and the brightest kids supposedly go to the "really good" colleges. Well, visit one of those places on graduation day. Forget all the exuberance and the drunkenness. Just look at the faces and assess how many of those kids are all set to join in the consensus and how many are going to go somewhere else.

Q: Do you know of any college that has a serious place for imagination in its courses?

A: Do you?

Q: No.

A: Almost as bad, how many colleges offer a long course in which the students have to decide what the underlying basis of reality is? I mean each student, on his own. It's such an obvious question—the one about reality—but you see, these colleges don't want to get into that because it's too dangerous. It moves you out of the consensus right away.

Q: You're saying it doesn't matter whether a person recognizes what he actually thinks reality is all about, or whether he imagines what reality is all about?

A: The two are entwined. You can't get to ultimates of any kind if you leave imagination out of the equation. Here we are, talking. If our imaginations were turned down to a much lower flame, we'd be having a much different conversation. We're creating this discussion. We're also getting to the truth. They work together, like brothers.

Q: Go a little further with that.

A: Imagination creates reality. That's the bottom line. Everything else is a stall. A postponement of the inevitable. Get it? What are we really doing as we sit here and talk? We're looking at one thing and one thing only: imagination. We're talking about imagination and its power. And we're using imagination to talk about imagination. Why are we doing that? Are we weird and different? No. It's what everybody does all the time. Whether they know it or not. Imagination is the cutting edge. The leading edge. Reality is what you get when you imagine. Reality is the evidence of the presence of imagination. This may sound confusing, but it isn't. It's very straightforward. Imagination is the great ocean. We create, and we swim in what we create, but all in all, it's all imagination. Some parts of it look and feel more solid than others. But even if we're dedicated scientists who believe in nothing except what we can prove, we're always swimming in imagination. And imagination is a word we use to refer to Basic Us. What we do, what we see. Imagination is everywhere. It's alive. It's the primary Water. The sooner we get used to it, the happier we are.

Q: How many past-life regressions would you say you've done?

A: Hard to say. Maybe hundreds.

Q: How did you do them?

A: I simply presented a starting image.

Q: For example?

A: A tree in a field. Something simple like that. Then the patient would flesh it out.

Q: Flesh it out how?

A: A few details at a time. I'd ask him what color the tree was. Did it have leaves? What type of leaf? What color? Did the roots show? His answers WERE the answers. It was his deal all the way.

Q: Simple stuff.

A: Yes.

Q: And eventually?

A: Oh, for example, in the scene the client was building, people would show up. Something would happen. A picnic under the tree with a family. Or a plane would land and people would get out. And then we'd be rolling.

Q: And in the end?

A: We'd have a full-fledged event.

Q: A whole event.

A: Yeah. Sometimes.

Q: Did you try to estimate how long ago it happened?

A: No.

Q: Why not?

A: Because you see, I wasn't really shooting for a past-life event.

Q: But you just said—

A: I know what I said. But I wasn't trying to verify past lives. I was doing work on event configuration.

Q: On what?

A: I was just getting the client to flesh out an event or a possible event. I just wanted to see what would happen. Because interesting things occur when you get somebody to flesh out an event in this way.

Q: What interesting things?

A: The client experiences energy. He experiences influx of energies. He can feel it in his body. Or he finds he can visualize things much better than he thought he could. Or he begins to hear things. He can feel the breeze blowing in the field near the tree. He can feel the grass on his bare feet.

Q: And sometimes these events turn out to be past lives.

A: Yes.

Q: How do you know that?

A: I told you, I don't. That's not what I'm shooting for. It might happen a month after the session. He says, "Remember that event we fleshed out, the one with me on an underwater reef catching those weird fish, and then I met a woman in a restaurant afterwards? Well, it happened. It wasn't something I invented. I was there in another life."

Q: Does it matter whether it really happened?

A: I don't think it matters at all.

Q: Why is imagination so powerful, so therapeutic?

A: It may be therapeutic, but not in the conventional sense of the word. You see, imagination is in chains. People keep it in chains. They work around it, they try to live their lives without overtly referring to it. They are playing this little game. How far can I go without using my imagination? Can I just figure stuff out and make progress and get where I want to go without really relying on my imagination?

Q: And can they?

A: No. But they keep trying. It's a game. It's an Earth-type game. A physical space-time game. See how far you can get without imagination.

Q: Why do they play that game?

A: Because that IS the game here. That's one reason why souls show up here. It's a kick. Imagination would take down the whole stage play in a second if it was really unleashed. THAT'S what people have to understand. Once you really unchain imagination, it's all over. You expand out of this show, and you are doing something more. You're finding a whole new gear in your car, a gear that allows you to fly. See, up to that point—

Q: You couldn't fly.

A: Right.

Q: So the stage play is all about how to shift the first four gears in your car better, how to go faster with those gears.

A: Yes. Get good at that and you're doing well. And that's fun. See if you can get really good at shifting through those gears. That's the challenge. And everybody likes that challenge. It's like chess. Play by the rules and see who is good.

Q: So everybody goes around pretty much pretending that they have no imagination.

A: They see how well they can do without imagination.

Q: Or they admit they have imagination, but they claim it's impotent. It can't really achieve great things.

A: Yeah. That's a variation on the same basic theme.

Q: Tell me a little more about the character of a session, the make-up of one of these "event configuration" sessions.

A: The guy comes in, he sits down, and I don't put him in a light trance.

Q: But you're a hypnotherapist.

A: I don't want him in a light trance for this. I want him just like he is. He closes his eyes and I tell him there is a scene. A busy street in a city. It's the middle of the afternoon, and it's drizzling. That's the image. That's where we start. You see, it doesn't MEAN anything. It's just a scene. And then I ask him what the sidewalk looks like. I ask him how high the curb is. I ask him if anything is in the gutter... And things just pop up. It's often very easy. If it isn't easy for him, I make it easier by asking more questions or adding a few details myself. But the point is, he's getting into his imagination IN A WAY THAT IS VERY VIVID. This isn't just fiddling around.

Q: And what good is this? Why is this important?

A: Because he is now wholly in the territory of imagination. He's there. He's constructing a parallel and separate world. And when you do that week after week, something new begins to take hold. Creative power. A trigger goes off. A cascade starts. A waterfall. The whole area of imagination and energy and power say, "We're happening! He pulled the trigger! He opened the door! We can come in now!"

Q: So the sessions are catalysts.

A: That's right. They all lead to the pulling of the trigger and the cascade. The big shift. The person now knows he has...what would the analogy be? He suddenly remembers he has a whole mansion on an island. He forgot all about it. He's been living in an apartment for 20 years and all of a sudden he remembers he has this sprawling mansion on a beautiful island.

Q: Do you ever get people who do everything they can to resist the changes that are happening to them?

A: Of course. I don't worry about that. There is going to be a wrestling match. It's good that the wrestling happens. The wrestling is the person coming to terms with all the changes. He is wrestling with himself, with his old ideas, with his old habits, with his old limitations. People who live "the Earth game" for many lifetimes can get this weird idea in their heads. They're like spoiled children. They want to move into a higher and wider realm, but they want all the old comforts of the Earth game.

Q: Old comforts?

A: Yeah. They want mommy and daddy to come downstairs at night and give them warm milk and listen to their complaints, the real complaints and the ones they make up. They want people around who will cater to their every whim. And then they want to resent those people, too. They want to be able to blame those friends and family when they don't magically get every little thing they want when they want it. It's basically a bunch of garbage, but it can be very attractive garbage to some people. But this therapy is a commitment. You can't expect to say, "Well, I've had 30 sessions now and I should be able to move my car with my mind without

turning on the ignition." That's crap. "I want what I want when I want it, and you're going to give it to me." I'm not giving people anything. They're achieving it for themselves. I'm providing the sessions, which are catalysts. We're all digging ourselves out of a hole here. We put ourselves into it, and we have to get ourselves out of it. This is the great adventure. And in the great adventure, you understand things about love you never understood before, and you also become stronger and tougher and more independent.

Q: Talk about the woman and the tower.

A: Yeah. Another client. She comes into a session and I set the scene. It's a kind of desert. She's looking around and I'm asking her questions and she's answering quickly, filling in details about the color of the sand and the plants and the temperature and the rocks, the colored rocks, and boom, there's a tower. It just springs up out of nowhere there in the middle of the desert. She's looking at it, this tall silver tower, and she's in a state of awe. She's mesmerized.

She started laughing and crying. This went on for a few minutes. She was moving around in the chair, she opened her eyes and closed them a few times, and she said, "The tower. I built it. It's there." And I said, "You just built it?" She said, "Lifetimes ago, I lived in that place, and I designed that tower. It was my life's work. It was the thing I waited my whole life to do." It was a revelation for her. Here she was in this life here in LA, working as a nurse, mainly cleaning up bedpans and taking people's temperature, and doing errands for doctors, and she realizes this. It's her tower. She's there looking at it again.

A part of her thought she had lost it forever. But she got it back. She could see it and feel it as clear as day. Inside her soul that afternoon, she grew a thousand feet. She became...she got back a whole territory of intelligence and creativity she had misplaced. That was her twentieth or thirtieth session. She had been gradually building up to this. And then it happened. Bang. And I don't even know whether she did, in fact, design that tower or whether she made the whole thing up. And I don't care. Something else, too. All this fleshing out of "scenery?" It's just a step in the right direction. It's not the ultimate at all. It's just a piece of the whole thing.

Q: Meaning what?

A: Catalytic experiences like these need to spill over into a person's life. There is still a threshold to cross, where the person says, "Here I am, I'm living in New York, and it's 2005, and I want to create something tremendous here."

Q: These scenes you have people flesh out. Let's talk more about the sessions.

A: Let's do it this way. I'll give you a rough history of phases in my work. This isn't exact, because I revisit earlier phases sometimes, with specific patients. But it's more or less accurate.

Early on, I was doing trance work. I put people in trances, and I made suggestions to them. Classic hypnosis. The good results were temporary, and then there was a falling back. The next phase was scenes, as I just described to you. No trance at all. The person would close his eyes, and I would describe the kernel of a scene, and he would flesh it out as I asked him questions about details of the scene. Some of these sessions appeared to unearth past-life experiences. Finally, I went to dreams. I would put the person into a light trance and I would describe the kernel of a dream. I'd say, "There is a figure floating over rooftops." And the person would flesh out the dream, with me asking questions about details. I found that introducing the concept of a dream gave the patient more freedom.

Q: Freedom in what sense?

A: The patient didn't feel he had to, for example, keep a coherent time flow going. He could skip around. It's a dream, see? All the rules about space and time and what's supposed to follow what are suspended. In a dream, you can be in a grocery store, and then the next second you're driving a car into a huge building that looks like a spaceport.

Q: So you wanted to give the patient's imagination more room, more possibilities.

A: Right.

Q: How do you put a person into a light trance?

A: This is tricky. There isn't any system. It's not just a matter of doing A and then B and then C. I've learned how to empathize with the patient. I can feel something about his state of mind and state of energy. It's feeling, not words. I can tune in there. So when I talk to him about relaxing, it has an effect. He does relax. Pressures ease off. I'm not really putting him under my control, though. Not in a serious way. I'm just getting him to the place where his random thoughts and little anxieties let up. I don't want him sleepy. I just want him in a space that is lucid because some extraneous things have drifted away. When he's there, we can begin.

Q: So then you describe a detail of a dream, and you ask him to add another detail.

A: Right. This part also has lots of intuitive action on my part. When to ask for another facet. When to say, "Where is the sun in relation to the forest?" 'What time of day is it?' Or, "Are the leaves on that little bush dark? What color are they?" I'm just moving him along so he can imagine more of the dream. I'm not leading him to a place I want him to go to. I just want him to expand the dream. I don't care how.

Q: And what effect does this have?

A: He's imagining with more freedom and depth than he's accustomed to. And a feedback is established, in the sense that he comes to realize he is imagining on a wider scale. He's seeing and feeling his own capacity to do that.

Q: When you have a person invent these dreams, and he's using his imagination, do you ever get paranormal effects?

A: Sure. A woman has been looking for a set of letters for years. She's a researcher. She's writing a book about life in America in the 18th century. In the middle of the session, she starts seeing a small library in a small town. She fleshes that out, and she suddenly realizes that's where one pack of letters is. She identifies the town where the library is, and after the session she goes to that place, and she finds the letters.

But these are side effects. I mean, they're more or less spontaneous occurrences that pop up.

Q: But the idea of having people invent dreams is relevant to these spontaneous paranormal happenings.

A: Oh, absolutely, because you give them the freedom to go all over the place and make connections they wouldn't otherwise make. And in making those so-called "irrational" connections, something pops up out of the hopper. They've gone past the normal A causes B and B leads to C. They've jumped ship, so to speak. It's like realizing that the map in your hands has an extra page you've never seen before, and that page is supposed to be held at right angles to the first page, and suddenly you see a whole new track of exploration, a different kind of track.

Q: When a patient invents dreams, he has that freedom.

A: That's why we call them dreams. Nothing is ruled out. You can go from A to M in the blink of an eye, without passing through the intermediate letters. Or you can forget all about A through Z and go somewhere else that has no labels at all. In sober moments, people want to exclude this kind of thing, but it's there and it's possible to do.

Q: And you do no interpretation of the dreams afterwards.

A: Interpretation? Are you kidding? Of course not. I had a patient who was inventing a dream about tigers and trains. The tigers were traveling on the train. All sorts of amusing and fascinating things were happening on that train, and then the patient opened his eyes and looked across my office and a cup on a table skidded a foot and fell on to the floor. Do I need to make up some ridiculous interpretation of that?

Q: How do you explain it?

A: I don't. All I say is, something happened to the creative power of the patient at that moment, and then BOOM. The patient was suddenly creating in a way that was new to him. He had left his old boundaries. That's what inventing the dream did for him. He was in the Old, and then he jumped into the New. And in the New, these paranormal things can happen.

Q: So you're saying that paranormal effects are a byproduct of creative power.

A: Yes. Although every person has his own slant on creative power.

Q: What does that mean?

A: If you got ten artists in a room and asked them to explain their creative impulse, you would get ten different descriptions. I wouldn't care what those descriptions were like. What difference does it make? One artist might say he's taking dictation from a prince who lives in a crackerjack box, and that's how he writes. (laughs) Another artist might say a Master is talking to him. So? It all comes out in the wash. The point is, all these artists ARE creating. That's the important thing. They aren't just sitting around in a haze of speculation or debilitating devotion. They're creating, on and on and on. Day after day, year after year. And somewhere along the line, paranormal effects jump up. They occur. Eventually, they occur more often.

I know there are people who can produce paranormal effects in a kind of demonstrative way. That's their approach. But in my experience, at some point this capacity becomes spotty and it tends to dry up, unless the person is also moving along a creative road with lots of power. The creative part is what's important.

Q: Before we started [this interview], you had something to say about immortality.

A: Right. I was working with a patient. Let me give you a little preface about this. Otherwise, it may be confusing. Sometimes, patients get into what I call constructs. They report all sorts of interesting things about their "inner landscape." These reports can get complicated. It's like exploring alien territory. Well, I just go along for the ride. I don't have any preconceived ideas about what "really" might be in that inner territory or what's supposed to be there. I don't care. A patient can tell me he has thirteen planets circulating inside a bottle inside a spaceship from a life he hasn't lived yet. I don't care. It's all fine with me. Do you see? He's inventing dreams. And he's trying to get somewhere. He wants to feel better or stronger or whatever. That's the basic setting.

Anyway, try to follow this. This patient recalled a number of past lives in sessions. That's what he said he was doing when he was inventing dreams. So after one session, he said he felt confident he had actually lived those lives, but he wasn't sure about the future. I asked him what he meant. He said he felt there was a block on the future. A block on him knowing he would live more lives. I asked him to describe that block. He said it was a kind of blank in his mind, a space where there should have been knowledge, but there wasn't. He said it felt odd to have that blank. So I told him we'd work on that in sessions to come.

Q: Did you?

A: Yes.

Q: What did you do?

A: When he was in a light trance, I told him to imagine a future life. He did.

Q: What kind of life was it?

A: He was an engineer living on an asteroid. His group was mining the asteroid for metals. They were going to use those metals to build some kind of ship. A space vehicle. His descriptions were quite clear.

Q: Did that convince him he would live more lives?

A: He was still stalled and puzzled. I asked him to examine that blank in his mind. He told me it was like an empty box. But it wasn't just empty. There was some kind of force that kept it blank. So I told him to examine that force. He tried. He said it was something like a force fence. It defined the boundaries of the blank space. It kept it blank. I thought that was very interesting. I had him keep checking out that force. He tried to see where the force was coming from. He was looking all over the place to find the beginning [of that force]. It seemed to be concealed.

Q: On purpose?

A: Yes.

Q: By someone else?

A: He wasn't sure. So I told him to imagine he did know about this force. For the next few sessions he told me all sorts of stories about the force and who was concealing its origin from him. They were very interesting stories. But they didn't crack the puzzle.

Q: This blank space in his mind and the force...it sounds like some sort of artifact. A whole structure placed there.

A: I was surprised that this process was taking so long. I thought we'd solve the whole business pretty quickly.

Q: So what you did you do?

A: I asked him to apply his own force to the force and try to blow it up.

Q: Mental force?

A: Yeah. When I told him to do that, he became scared. He said he couldn't do it. I asked him why. He said he was afraid that if the blank space dissolved he would lose something important. The blank was precious to him. Now, he didn't know that before. He discovered it. He discovered how he felt about it. So I asked him to tell me what the blank might represent to him. He gave me a whole lot of possible explanations. The one that made the most sense to him was CLARITY.

Q: The blank space represented clarity to him.

A: Yes. An empty space that wasn't cluttered with information. It was like a HOME SPACE.

Q: You mean he "operated from there?"

A: Mentally, in his private world, he was using that blank space as somewhere he could think clearly. I didn't really know what he was talking about, but I went with it. Well, this guy said he was using that blank space as a center for thinking. At work. At his job. For him, the blank space was a place where he could operate freely.

Q: But he also felt the blank space was a block. It was blocking him from realizing he would live future lives.

A: Yes. It had an upside and a downside.

Q: Because he was using this blank space as a "home port" for rational thinking, he was afraid that if he blew it up, if he got rid of it, he wouldn't be able to think as well.

A: Yeah. He said he would feel naked without it. So I had him try to think from other spaces. I had him invent all sorts of different spaces in his mind where he could think from. He came up with parks, banks of rivers, empty houses, airports, and so on. These were invented mental spaces. He tried to think from those places.

Q: Could he do it?

A: It was slow going. But after a while, he became more easy with it.

Q: And did that help?

A: Yeah. Finally, he got to this: the blank space was the "home" of rational thinking for him. Now, if he tried to assume he would live future lives, the blank space would kick in. It would rationally remind him that this was a preposterous idea.

Q: So he would submit to that.

A: Yeah. He didn't want to go against the "rationality" of the blank space. He needed that space. He didn't want to disturb it or upset it.

Q: He was a kind of slave to that blank space.

A: Right.

Q: But he had no problem getting into PAST lives.

A: Right. For some reason, that didn't ruffle the feathers, so to speak, of the blank space. That [past lives] was considered rational. But future lives? No. That was going too far.

Q: Weird.

A: I know. But that's the way it played out. So he was getting somewhere now. He could see that the blank space was a very good thing for him, but it also blocked him from accepting the reality of future lives. He could see that situation. For the first time. And HE, for his own reasons, wanted to accept the fact that he could live future lives.

Q: And it was very clear to him that this blank space in his mental landscape was where he did his rational thinking.

A: Yeah. And anything IRRATIONAL was forbidden.

Q: Wild.

A: Yeah.

Q: Did he use the word "forbidden?"

A: Yeah. It started coming up frequently.

Q: Like—

A: Like forbidden fruit. Like the Garden of Eden. I could see that, but I didn't want to say anything about it. I wanted him to find that out—if it was relevant.

Q: And did he find it out?

A: One day, there it was. The whole garden laid out for him to see.

Q: Where was it laid out?

A: Around the blank space. It was surrounding the blank space. The blank space was his "free port" where he could think clearly. But all around it was the force of the garden. The garden had its rules.

Q: This was his personal version of the Garden of Eden.

A: It wasn't the Biblical story in literal terms. But of course there were similarities.

Q: So he had invented and refined the Garden story for himself.

A: Maybe. And right in the middle of the garden was this zone where he was free to operate.

Q: The blank space.

A: Yeah.

Q: How did he react when he found all this out?

A: (laughs) He was plenty pissed off.

Q: Really.

A: Yeah. He felt it was a terrible imposition on him. Even though he had put this whole thing together himself. He was steaming. He wanted to get rid of the garden right away.

Q: He saw the limiting aspect.

A: Sure.

Q: So what happened?

A: He tried to blow it up.

Q: The garden.

A: Yeah. But there was still something holding him back. So we worked some more. I had him describe the garden in great detail. The more he filled in the details, the more he began to see that the garden was a kind of deal.

Q: A deal?

A: Yes. A deal he had made. With God.

Q: Oh.

A: The deal was, he would get the blank space, the free zone in the middle of the garden, and God would get everything else. God would be able to limit his actions and his thoughts, "for his own good."

Q: Then?

A: He realized that God, the God he was making a deal with, was something he had cooked up himself. An artifact of his own imagination.

Q: So then—

A: He had been tapping into an archetype.

Q: God?

A: No. Adam.

Q: Really.

A: Yeah. Adam was the key archetype. He loved Adam. For him, Adam stood for all sorts of freedom and the newness of experience. Adam was all about the ability to have ecstasy. Adam was always like the dawn of a new day. But along with that, he [Jack's patient] had constructed this whole edifice—the garden, God, the blank space in the middle, the whole situation.

Q: Quite a creation.

A: I thought so.

Q: So what did you do?

A: I had him talk to me about Adam. That went on for several sessions, several hours. All sorts of stuff poured out. He hadn't known before that Adam was even there. It was a great discovery. And the more he talked about Adam, the more the whole edifice began to crumble. He was getting to the primary archetype in this whole situation. He was getting a direct line to Adam. I could see the energies around him [the patient]. Very powerful. He was tapping into all sorts of energies in the sessions. He was changing. He was getting stronger and more confident.

Q: So what about his invented God and the Garden and the blank space?

A: They dissipated like a balloon that was pricked. The air escaped. The structure collapsed of its own accord.

Q: And how did the patient feel?

A: He felt fine. He could still think very clearly. He didn't need that blank space. It was all very natural, this change. Between sessions, he began writing reams about Adam. All sorts of material. Very interesting.

Q: And the future lives?

A: It wasn't a problem anymore. Basically, the patient saw that he was immortal, as a soul, as a spirit. He could look back and he could see past lives, and he could look forward and see the possible shapes of future lives. An integration had occurred. The separated pieces had come together.

Q: What did he do with Adam after that?

A: He kept tapping in and writing reams. He felt he had "a new friend." Some months later, he dropped the whole thing. He wasn't interested in Adam anymore.

Here is the thing you have to understand. All of this, the blank space and what it meant to him, both the good and the bad, the Garden, his invented God, and Adam, all of it was the way HE approached his problem. He felt he had a problem about not being able to accept future lives. See? All of this was coming from the patient, not from me. He had his own idea of his problem. Who knows what to say about that? I didn't say anything. He was inventing his way along a path that meant possible progress to him. He was imagining all sorts of things on his own, and when he finally reached the end of the train track, he felt terrifically better. He felt changes in his inner landscape. He was much happier.

I don't care whether any of this was real, because what is real in a situation like this? It's his sense of it that's important.

Along the way, I had had him invent a number of dreams, and during that period, he had some very interesting things happen to him. He reconciled with his wife and his family. He started a new business. He funded a few people who were doing important research on environmental problems. All this was happening fast, and he was enjoying it. One day in my office, he sat up in his chair and said, "My wife just left me something."

His wife hadn't been to his apartment for over a year. She had a key, but she hadn't gone there. When he went home, he found a note from her in the living room. She was asking him to meet her, so they could finally talk things over.

Q: Would you accept the label "human potential" as being a focus of your work?

A: Sure. I don't care about labels, but that one is okay. The more I work with patients, the more I see that I'm getting them to imagine and create. That's the core of it. When I stick to that, all sorts of other things happen. Good things. These people are shifting from a straight-line approach to life to a creative approach. Straight-line is fine, but it reaches a limit. After that, you can graduate to a different echelon. You can break through and break out.

###END###

February 22, 2011

What strikes me about all the interviews I did with Jack...he takes his time. He doesn't feel pressed to make a few points and stop. He not only has a generosity of spirit, but of language, too. It seems, these days, people want quicker and quicker messages. They have less patience. It's too bad. But I'm certainly not going to cut down things to fit the present mold. Jack deserves all the space I can give him.

In the late 1980s and early 90s, Jack and I had many conversations. He was, I believe, the most innovative hypnotist who ever walked the face of the Earth. Yet, he eventually gave up traditional hypnotism for other methods which he felt would better serve people.

The following conversation took place in the spring of 1988, just prior to publication of my first book, AIDS INC. Jack was instrumental in that project, along several fronts. And just after the book appeared in print, in his typically mysterious way, he told me the book was on a plane, in a diplomatic pouch, to the USSR, where, he said, people "will be very interested in your findings."

The following interview (which is not about AIDS INC.) focuses on magic and the means to attain it.

Q: Do you think people are becoming more superficial?

A: Not only that, they're becoming cartoons of themselves. But thankfully, there are still some of us who can think.

Q: What do you mean, cartoons?

A: They assess their supposed strengths, and they carve themselves down to fit a desire for success. This leaves them in a strange place, like a bright penny lying in the street. For a second it looks good, but then you realize it's only a penny. This is how you get a personality shift. A person fastens on to one idea about themselves or the world, and then he sculpts himself to fit that idea. Then everything goes to hell.

Q: Because he becomes terminally bored.

A: Not at first, but eventually, yes. The key to all movements and groups of any kind...a person joins up, feels a thrill of newness—and then up the road realizes dimly something is missing. (laughs) What's missing is a significant part of himself! It's fabulous joke when you think about it. A self-performed lobotomy.

Q: Done to attain success.

A: Broadly speaking, yes. And you're right, boredom is the outcome. But not ordinary boredom. A deep cloud of nothing. A cloud that wraps a person up in non-creativity. It's like a hypnotic state, in which the patient is sitting there, hoping for a suggestion that will change his life. But it never comes. It's quiet. Nothing happens.

Q: People have to decide what they really want.

A: But you see, how can they decide when they're only half themselves, when they're cut off from the bulk of what they are? It's a pickle. It's like trying to drive a very fast car with your knees, or with your eyes closed. Self cut off from self. People parading around like caricatures of what they are. It's the Disney dream come true.

Q: In the old Disney version, the fantasy is very narrow. It's a very narrow road.

A: Or here is my analogy. It's like a performer with no audience.

Q: Why do you say that?

A: You can look at this in one of two ways. You can say we are all the audience now, or you can say there is no audience. Because audiences have been trained to react like dogs. They hear certain bells, and they drool. Is that a real response? No, the point is to break through all that and come out on the other side.

Q: And that's done how?

A: That's a secret.

Q: What?

A: It's a secret. Every person who wants to has to find out for himself. There is no other way. Do you see?

Q: There is no system.

A: Exactly. Systems are sold to prevent breakthroughs from happening. That's why they're so popular.

Q: "Here, buy this system and you'll fail for sure."

A: Yeah. But the package looks nice. Isn't it great? People don't open the package because they were only buying the package and the idea that they could be a winner.

Q: Tell me what you mean by breakthrough.

A: You find lost parts of yourself. You stop repeating yourself over and over. You stop being so gentle about everything. You know. "Be nice and you'll get a gold star." Be nice and you'll get psychically dead. This gold-star crap is a form of behavior modification. Try this sometime. Tell people they should become spontaneous. Tell a lot of people. Watch what happens. Nothing happens. Because most people don't even have an inkling about what you mean.

Q: Why don't they?

A: Because they've programmed themselves to ignore that whole area. They've built a wall.

Q: They've done this consciously?

A: Yes. And then as time passes, they forget what they did.

Q: You've seen this with patients?

A: Of course. I've had patients remember what they did to themselves, as clearly as they remember walking down the street yesterday. It's quite illuminating. They see it like a map, all laid out in front of them. But that doesn't mean they're suddenly free.

Q: Why not?

A: Because freedom is just opportunity. You actually have to do something to make freedom real. Removing brainwashing doesn't result in a miracle. You have to eliminate the tendency to brainwash yourself again. And you do that by creating something you really desire.

Q: Desire is a tricky concept.

A: Sure. You get a person who makes a living picking lint off the boss's suit. Then he un-brainwashes himself, and he says, "Now I'm going to pick the lint off with my left hand rather than my right. That's my desire." You see? Some people want that level of superficiality. I mean, that's the only level they can see. They need wider experience. They need to live. They need all sorts of new experience, so they can find out something closer to their real desires. I've worked with patients who, even after a long time, show no evidence that they have deep desires. It's rather astonishing. It can drive you to believe some humans are actually androids.
(laughs)

Q: What do you think is going on there?

A: I have several answers. I'll give you one. Some people are so thirsty for control coming from outside themselves—they want to conform so badly—they'll opt for a whole slate of desires that are entirely synthetic. They sound synthetic and they look synthetic. It's a form of conformity that runs very deep in them. They basically come into this life with that thirst. Nothing will deter them.

Q: Have you learned anything from these people?

A: Yes. Looking for the programming that causes them to function this way is a dead end. They're inventing their own destiny as they go. They're building the conformity, brick by brick.

Q: Dead art.

A: Dead on arrival. They're inventing the whole charade. It made me look at the whole notion of programming from a new angle. You see, people are imagining reality and then responding to it. So I could put them in trance and then give them

suggestions, but then they'd just start to imagine reality according to my guideposts. Do you see? I'd start them on a new path, but they'd be doing the same basic thing.

Q: How do you get around that?

A: It took me a long time to see it. You get them to invent all sorts of different realities. This isn't as easy as it sounds. But the fundamental approach is valid. How do you wake a person up? You get him to do what he does while he's asleep. You get him to sleep in many different ways. You go on and on with this, and eventually he'll realize he's asleep and he'll start to wake up.

Q: This works with everybody?

A: No one thing works with everybody.

Q: I know you sometimes use a technique where you have people invent many dreams.

A: It's one way to get a person to widen their scope. Invent a dream. A dream isn't bound by time constraints or time patterns or location or plot line. You can have a dream where you're shifting from place to place without apparent reason. It just happens.

Q: In physical reality, this doesn't happen.

A: And that tells you something about physical reality. It's only one form out of many possibilities. Just because it happens to be the form we live in, that doesn't mean it's the only way consciousness can operate.

Q: So we have art. An artist goes outside the background context.

A: And why should he want to do that? Because he's frustrated by the constraints. He glimpses or sees other possibilities and he wants to express them. We could do a lot worse than write our own books of dreams.

Q: A lot of people wouldn't be ready for that.

A: Well, a lot of people wouldn't be ready for a free society, either. Does that mean the rest of us shouldn't have one? What makes a person not ready is obsession. For instance, someone is fixated on having something. I mean really fixated. And in life, he can't get it. He's chaining himself inside all sorts of limitations, and yet at the same time he wants something that lies outside those self-imposed boundaries. So if he begins to invent or imagine all sorts of new possibilities for himself, he's always going to do it so he can get that thing he so desperately wants.

Q: He keeps undermining himself, because he always brings it back to that thing he keeps obsessing about.

A: Yeah. It isn't a pretty picture. He's in too much of a hurry. He wants a billion dollars tomorrow. That's his fixation. Or whatever it is. So when he opens up his

imagination, he can't really fall in love with that process—because he always thinks if he has more imagination and creativity, maybe he'll get that billion dollars tomorrow. So his experience is one failure after another, because he has that desire to become Midas tomorrow. It's an odd thing, but I've seen it. It's one way people can stay immature for a very long time. They don't really grow up. They're in perpetual adolescence.

Q: On a larger scale, that seems to be happening to America.

A: More and more people believe they can be Midas tomorrow. And more and more people believe they can have political utopia tomorrow.

Q: The utopia turns out to be some version of collectivism.

A: I've had a people write their own books of dreams.

Q: How does that work?

A: It's very simple. They just keep inventing dreams and writing them down. Do that for a year every day, and you'll see some very interesting changes in your conception of reality. But you have to remain grounded at the same time. Because you are living in this world, in this form of reality. That's the trick, to remain grounded.

Q: Almost sounds like you're talking about a contradiction.

A: Almost, but not quite. An analogy. Yoga. You're moving into different areas of consciousness, but you're also doing strenuous physical work. One isn't separate from the other. Or take this as an example. A person has an objective—and he can dream about it and see it fulfilled in the dream. The more this happens, over a period of time, the more power he actually has to make that desire come true in life. His psychic power becomes stronger. But he's also working to make the desire come true. I mean real work. Get-your-hands- dirty work. Every day. The two aren't completely separate.

Q: But there is magic.

A: Of course there's magic! Behind every mask is a magic state of affairs. You can see it, you can feel it, but you also have to pursue it. Work and magic aren't contradictory.

Q: What about this old statement—the world is just a stage.

A: Physical reality is a stage set. Just one. We're slaves to that one way. And we tend to react like slaves when the door to the jail cell opens. We peek out, we take a few steps, and then we go back in. This is the joke. It's a very big joke. If only more people could laugh at it. That would be progress. But we take it all so seriously. Even the part about escaping. We're in a comedy, and we're playing the part of tragic figures. It's a bad fit.

Q: It's like a debate with argument and counter-argument. It goes on and on.

A: Yes, that's right. You remember Steppenwolf, the Hesse novel. Harry, the main character, is all wrapped up in his loneliness, his sense of exile. And Pablo, his guide, is brimming with good cheer and amusement. And the scene at the end, the cosmic laughter. It's real, that laughter. It's the exposure of the grand joke. You were living inside a jewel box, and you thought it was the whole universe. And then the lid comes up and you realize the truth, which you've always known, underneath all the tons of bullshit.

Q: What happens in hypnotism?

A: Essentially, you have an unspoken contract. The patient is saying, "I want to get out of the thing I'm in. So get me out. I'll surrender myself to you. Get me out." And the therapist is saying, "Follow my lead. Do what I say. And you'll experience a shift that feels better than you're feeling now. You'll get out for a little while. You'll feel that." That's what happens on one level. On another level, the patient is saying, "I want to believe. Make me believe something exciting." The therapist says, "Okay, I will. I'll make you believe the rules can be broken. I'll show you they can." So he puts the patient in a trance, where the patient is relaxed and receptive, and then he says, "That ankle of yours that's sprained. It's healing right now. It's getting better." And the patient believes what the therapist is telling him. He believes in the therapist. Strongly. And that belief puts him in a new reality where things can happen spontaneously. That belief surpasses the rules. And when the therapist brings him out of the trance, his ankle is better. The swelling is down. The pain has diminished.

Q: So why can't that breaking of the rules become the new reality all the time?

A: Well, it can. But not because the patient has such a strong belief in the therapist. That would be unworkable as a permanent and forever fix.

Q: But if the patient, on his own, radically changed his beliefs?

A: Yes. That's how magic comes about. The question is, does it happen in five seconds?

Q: You don't think it does.

A: I think the patient—who is not a patient anymore—needs to find a vehicle to carry him forward. Well, the vehicle doesn't do the work. The person does. But he uses a vehicle to help him.

Q: What kind of vehicle?

A: That question is like asking, "Is there one fingerprint we can all share?" And I would say no. Each person has to find such a vehicle for himself. It has to suit him. He might change vehicles a dozen times, as he goes. For example, for you it might be

theater. You act. You write. You direct. I don't know. I'm picking something out of a hat.

Q: And how long would I do that?

A: Now we're going to get metaphysical. How long does it take a person to become a slave? How long until his own slavery, as real as it is, becomes entirely invisible to him? How long does it take for him to fully accept the rules of physical reality—this stage play we're in? This is where we have to depart from the culture we're living in. We have to talk about many lives, living many lives, reincarnation, and so forth.

Q: You're saying it takes many lives to sink all the way down into the stage play we call reality, with no consciousness that there is something else—and therefore, it could take many lives to get out of it. To get to magic on a permanent basis.

A: Yeah. I know people don't like to hear that. They want the glimpse of magic, the moment of magic they had on Tuesday to become permanent right now. They want that dream to take hold now and never leave. They want to levitate tonight and be able to levitate and hover and fly forever after that. So I say, sure, okay, why not? Are you ready to stop believing in the rules of the stage play altogether? Are you ready to move beyond that now? And are you also ready to be able to leave the stage play and come back to it whenever you want to—because, since you're here in this stage play, it appears you have some attachment to it. It appears on some level that you want it. I'm not imposing limitations on anybody. I'm just reporting on the situation as I see it. What's magic? Levitation, bi-location, invisibility, instantaneous shifting from one place to another, seeing the future, telepathy, changing shape, time travel, telekinesis...is that what magic is? Spontaneously projecting a thought and turning it into a reality in front of you and everybody else? This is what we all think magic is? Right? Okay, I agree. These are magical things. So how long does it take for a slave to get there, to leave this old reality behind? And then to come back and be here and live inside this stage play? Exit and enter? Anytime he wants to? Isn't this what we mean by magic? So I'm saying magic is invention of new realities relative to this monolithic one. And you get there by inventing all sorts of new realities, on and on. You keep doing that, regardless of what you may feel. You keep on. And for that, you need a vehicle. And you keep on inventing realities that are close to what you desire. That's what you do. You need a vehicle to do that. Maybe a better way of saying it is, you need a medium by which to express those new realities. Do you see?

Q: The traditional culture supposes that a person has to remove or de-condition limiting beliefs in order to make progress.

A: Yes, I know that. I know all about it.

Q: And?

A: And I haven't found that to be true. First of all, many people get all wound up and tied up and encased in the method, whatever it is, of getting rid of limiting

beliefs. They get snarled up in that. It becomes a habit. A crutch. And second, how do you really get rid of a limitation? You put a cow in a corral with a fence, and you leave him there for two years. That's limiting, wouldn't you say? Now you open the door. Is he supposed to stand there and think about how and why he's become used to being inside the corral? Or is he supposed to walk out into the open field? He has to walk out. So it's the same with this reality. But there is one big difference. We don't see the open field. All we see is this reality. So we don't just walk out of the corral. We wouldn't know how or where to go. Instead, we invent different and new realities. Is that a little clearer now? We become inventors of new realities. And in doing that, we gain new power. And somewhere up the line, that power translates into magic. We can do magic.

Q: So, to invent different realities, you need a vehicle, a medium like paint or words. You don't just sit there and ruminate.

A: Right. I knew a person who made maps of lands and countries that don't exist. Hundreds of maps. An architect. After working with him for a while, I told him it was time for him to invent new realities by the ton. And he didn't know how. I said to him, "You're an architect! Make models. Make cities." And he went off and thought about it and decided to create maps. From what I hear, he's still going strong.

Q: By inventing realities, you eventually get to magic.

A: It isn't hocus-pocus.

Q: People wish it was.

A: Yeah. I know. (laughs) Sorry to disappoint them.

Note: Some of the ideas in this interview came from Jack, and some came from him by way of me. Jack and I talked a great deal in the old days. A large amount of cross-fertilization occurred. I carry on this work today.

###END###

February 24, 2011

DREAM ANALYSIS

In this interview Jack discusses dreams. He and I talked about this subject many times.

Q: I look at dreams as adventures. Cultures have always been fixated on analyzing them and finding the hidden meanings.

A: Well, when you think about it, trying to dissect things for hidden meanings happens all over the place. The point is, when you arrive at the meaning, what do you have? The whole business falls apart. You're sitting there with a few sentences of translated meaning, and it really doesn't help much. I admit it can be an intriguing exercise, and I'm not knocking it, but it makes me yawn.

Q: The most interesting thing about dreams is that people have them. They're lying in bed, and they're entering into all sorts of dimensions, and it feels very real. Adventure.

A: Well, you would say that, because you're an artist.

Q: What would you say?

A: I agree. Many dreams follow the sequence of desire and then manifestation. You want to experience something, and then, bang, it's there. You're in a full-blown setting, and there are other people, and you're feeling what you want to feel. Or you could reverse it. You're in a setting, you size it up, you see what you desire, and then it happens.

Q: In other words, it's natural. It's what people want.

A: They would like their waking lives to be like that. And in the service of that goal, in dreams, all the rules of physical reality go out the window. Dreams are a glimpse into another kind of reality, where the rules aren't the rigid context. The rules about what can happen with space and time and what can't happen don't apply. In that sense, dreams are like art. In art, you can create what you want to.

Q: So there is a general universality in dreams.

A: The universality is, the rules of physical reality don't take precedence. They don't determine the outcome. They don't inhibit the action. You can be in a room talking to someone one second, and the next second you can be up in the clouds flying over a city. This isn't "a symbol" of something. It's not about hidden meaning. It's what it is.

Q: That's too stark for a lot of people.

A: Well, sure. But so what?

Q: In a lot of cultures, if you have a dream, you're bound to interpret it by the doctrine of the current mythology or religion.

A: Yeah. One story used to explain another story. If you wrote a novel, would you feel compelled to write another novel explaining the first one? It's ridiculous. Dreams have inherent magic in them. Whereas, in your waking life, if you want to go from one city to another, you drive, or you book a flight. You go through all sorts of preparation. Those are the rules. That's the way it works. In a dream, you can just move from one city to another in no time at all.

Q: That's what I'm saying. That instant travel—it's part of the adventure. If you want to think about a dream after you wake up, think about that.

A: Let's say you actually had a person who could do that. He's standing on the corner of 42nd Street and Broadway, and then he's standing on the beach in San Francisco. No time elapses. All sorts of explanations would be given, in addition to all the denials that it ever happened. He's an alien from outer space. He's a god. He's the devil. He's able to hypnotize everybody and make them think he has this extraordinary power. He was using some fabulous machine to make the space shift happen. It was technology, because otherwise it couldn't have happened. You see, this is the analysis. The interpretation of the event. In the same way, people have dreams and then they wake up and analyze what happened.

Q: They can't just accept it.

A: They can't enjoy it.

Q: You must have patients who tell you about their dreams.

A: Sure. One woman has flying dreams. I finally got her to remember and really feel the sensation of taking off from the ground and how good it was. She decided that was a hell of a lot more important than "what the dream meant." She was flying! She was showing off! She was a performer with an audience. And she was flying!

Q: When we say people are asleep and they need to wake up, we don't mean they need to stop dreaming.

A: Dreaming is being awake. Awake to a different kind of reality, where imagination has much greater power. Dreams supply what's missing in physical reality. There are places all over the world where professionals conduct experiments designed to see whether paranormal events can happen. They run tests, experiments, and so on. That's fine, but I like to point out that the flavor of the experiments is very bland compared to dreams. Magic isn't bland. It's alive. It has color and depth and profound emotion. If you try to leave that out, you don't have magic anymore. I don't know what to call it, but it isn't magic. Do you want to put Merlin in a lab? That would be a joke.

Q: You have some of your patients invent dreams by the truckload.

A: Yes. It's a natural tendency and deep desire—dreaming—so why not do it more and do it when you're awake? What happens is you begin to blend different states of mind. You have states of mind while a person is asleep that give birth to dreams, and then you have the states of mind people usually inhabit when they're awake...so why not blend them? Why not explore that?

Q: You're saying there is more than one kind of desire. The sort of desire people experience when they're awake is different from the sort of desire they experience when they're asleep.

A: It's a different quality. In dreams, desire produces a scene, an event, an experience just like that. Desire gives rise to fulfillment. In waking life, it feels different.

Q: Is that because waking life is so different from sleeping?

A: Maybe. But I think it's something else. When we're awake, we bamboozle ourselves into thinking that our desires carry relatively little power. And we make the excuse, "Well, the world doesn't work according to desire. It works on its own, like a machine, and we have to plug into the machine and go along with its processes."

Q: Lots of people have come along and talked about manifesting desire in the world.

A: I know. And usually it doesn't pan out. Something goes wrong. What I'm saying is, it has to do with state of mind. A person can occupy all sorts of different states of mind—and then different outcomes will result. Dreaming is a state of mind that works when you're asleep. So what happens when you're doing something to blend that dreaming state or connect it to waking life in the world? That's what I'm doing with my patients now. It's a work in progress.

Q: Any preliminary findings?

A: I'm encouraged. That's all I can say right now. I have people keeping a book of dreams. Every day, they invent and write down dreams in the book. They aren't reporting on dreams. They're creating them. While they're awake. You see? So in that writing, they're moving through states of mind they wouldn't ordinarily occupy while they're awake.

Q: A similar thing would happen in a play on stage.

A: Yes. An actor is playing a role that doesn't exist anywhere except on the stage. He's inventing. The whole play—somewhat like a dream—is taking place on the stage. And the audience is watching a dream unfold. They want that. They want to be awake and watch a dream. They want that experience. They want to blend different states of mind. But most of all, they just want to see a dream while they're awake.

Q: What you're doing with patients is like the other side of the coin of lucid dreaming.

A: It seems like it. From what I understand, the practice of lucid dreaming involves cultivating the ability to realize, in the middle of a dream, that you are dreaming—but you don't wake up in bed. You're still "in it." But you know you're having a dream. And then you direct the rest of the dream according to the way you want it to happen. Well, I'm saying, let's take people who are awake, and let's have them invent dreams and write them down. Let's take it from the other end.

Q: What about nightmares?

A: Well, this goes back to what you were saying. A dream is an adventure. Suppose you could decide to embrace "a bad dream" and not be thrown way off by it. While the so-called nightmare is happening, you're embracing the whole thing because you want to experience it. And so the dream itself takes on a different character. You don't retract and shrink back so much. You "wrap your arms around" the nasty creature who is coming at you. I believe then that the dream will take on a different character. It won't be fearful in the same way.

Q: The ancient Tibetans were very much involved in cultivating extraordinary capacities. Levitating, telekinesis, and so on. For them, universe was a product of mind. If you could fully know that, you could experience it. You could make things disappear and create new things out of nothing.

A: I find something of the quality of dream in their work. The flavor of it. They had a culture that supported that. They were intensely creative. They did very intense exercises over long periods of time. It wasn't your standard religion.

Q: In the past, we've talked about film as dream.

A: Well, I think that was the early impact of films. They were dreams on the screen. It was a bit like being led into your own psyche and desires. Whereas, realism is about the fixation on having things as they are in the physical world.

Q: The early films of Ingmar Bergman had a certain dream quality. And even though the subject matter was, at times, despondent, it was alive.

A: When a person goes to escape depression, where does he go? He looks for any kind of life line. He tries to get back into the world. The everyday world. But after a while, what does he have? He may be somewhat happier, but the "real world" doesn't give him the sense of really being alive in an intense way. No matter how you approach it, the physical world is missing certain factors. It's missing everything that lies beyond the boundaries laid down by the rules. It's missing all those qualities you can find in dreams.

Q: The phrase "inventing dreams." What does it mean?

A: Just what it says. You make up a dream. Then another one. It doesn't matter what they are. It doesn't mean "the one dream you want to fulfill all your life." Sure, throw that one into the mix. But it means plural. Dreams. Invent dreams. Write them down. Flesh them out. Not just vague general statements. Just keep making them up. Dreams. One after another.

Q: It occurs to me that no one I've ever talked to has described a dream in which he was buying and selling something.

A: (laughs) Yeah. That's the main thing that goes on in the world. But when people sleep, they want to do something else. There is something about the human race—they want to build and envision all sorts of complex machines. It's fascinating. And the mind sometimes works that way, too. How complex a thought can you lug around? How intricate can you make the processes of mind? How many halls and corridors and rooms can you install in landscapes of the interior? This gives rise to the idea that the mind itself—and everything you want to discover about it—is very complex. It has to be. You see? So the journey of discovery will be a very long one. I have no problem with that, if people want to entertain and amuse themselves that way. Great. But I think there is short-line way of understanding. You see how the physical world works. It has space and time. And so on. You can't go from point A to B without some amount of time passing. You can't look at a clock on a table and make it disappear. You can't conjure up a rock out of nowhere and make it sit on that table. There are things you can do and can't do. That's the message of physical reality. People who are conscious know there is something wrong with that. There's something wrong with that formulation. It isn't complete. We humans aren't just another species that fits into the overall framework of physical reality. There are groups who want us to believe that, who want us to make ourselves more stupid, who want us to imagine ourselves as just another kind of primate. But that's not so. We aren't. The trouble is, when some people get hold of this idea of the dream, they use it to remain forever adolescent. They use it to become—

Q: Glazed donut heads.

A: Yes. They use it to excuse themselves from having anything to do with the world. In a juvenile way. They don't really want to think. They just want to get what they want when they want it. They don't want to work. They want a gift to arrive in the mail that will change them for all time. It's pathetic. I'm not talking about that at all. I'm talking about something much, much different. Why do we have this capacity to dream when we sleep? Why do we have this capacity to experience a different order of reality full-bore? Do we say it's just a minor diversion, like a TV show? Or do say it's a profound clue about the nature of multiple Realities and how we've accommodated ourselves to this one type of physical reality, when in fact an infinity of other types of experience are available to us? None of this would be a problem, if it weren't for the fact that we want and desire those wider experiences—and if we don't reach them or move toward reaching them, we become frustrated and bored and passive.

Q: By "wider experiences," you're including the capacity to make paranormal events happen.

A: Of course I am.

Q: You were...[there is a break in the conversation, and then Jack is off on another topic]

A: I once saw a man dance out a dream. It was a very interesting experience. He did it in a dance studio. There were a few of us there. This was a dream he'd had a few months earlier, which he called the most thrilling experience of his life. He was walking on clouds above a forest covered by fog, in the early morning, and birds of strange shapes and colors came up from the canopy and hovered near him. He walked on the clouds and felt green rays shooting up through his feet, all the way up his body into his head...when he danced this out in the studio, the whole thing transformed. There was no music. His dance was obviously about him absorbing and using that energy to be able to fly. The dance went on for close to two hours. He was trying to learn to fly, literally. And the process was an exhilarating struggle. A few days later, he told me several nagging health problems he'd been having went away. He said the whole business about being able to fly had been stuck in his craw since he was a child, and he finally realized it was causing him chronic frustration, for many years. He said it didn't matter if he never learned to fly, he was "working on it," and his body was undergoing many changes, as a result. So, in that case, a desire or goal which everybody would say was totally impossible and crazy became the impetus for him to transform himself. He didn't automatically reject the whole idea. He accepted it as a real desire, and he began to dance it through. He kept at it, too. He did his dance many times after that. It was alchemy in motion.

Q: That's quite unusual, to say the least. He didn't reject the desire.

A: He kept expanding on it. I thought it was also interesting that he was a football player...see, the point is, we all have desires which are theoretically impossible. These are kinds of desires that show up and are temporarily fulfilled in dreams. We decide to bury them. And we think it doesn't matter. But it can matter.

Q: You're talking about the tension between "the rules" of physical reality and what we want.

A: Right. I could also extend that to the rules of society, but let's stick to this, because I think it's far more interesting and less understood. Let's suppose you have a person who really wants to move a cigarette lighter across a table with his mind. He sits there, every day, and he tries, for an hour or two. Nothing happens. But he wants it to happen. That's tension. He can't do it. So he starts to write about it or dance it through or whatever. He's now giving expression to a desire that runs counter to the limits of physical reality, as these limits are generally understood or accepted. He's engaging with a desire that "has no basis" in what we call ordinary life. You see? It doesn't mean he's gone crazy or he quits his job or he does drugs. It doesn't mean he leaves his family or grows a beard two feet long or mumbles to

himself. This is a straight-out expression of desire. Now, he has to find a way to express the desire. He has to work with this.

Q: In a way, this was what the Tibetans did. They had exercises for this.

A: Yeah. In a way.

###END###

February 25, 2011

REBELS AGAINST REALITY

As most of you know, I move back and forth between very different subjects in my work. Medical fraud, political commentary, the moves made by global elites, and imagination/creative power/magic.

These interviews with Jack represent what I consider to be the most important area of my long-time focus: imagination/creative power/magic.

In 1988, during a conversation with Jack, I kiddingly suggested we form a group called RAR, Rebels Against Reality. A few days later, we picked up the thread of that comment, and we did an interview, part of which I've been able to reconstruct from my notes. I hesitated to print this one at first, because it moves into areas lots of people are quite unfamiliar with—particularly if they're looking to learn something by comparing it to what they already know...but then I realized I'd crossed that line a long time ago. Way long ago. Buckle up.

Q: So you like the idea. Rebels Against Reality.

A: If it's taken far enough.

Q: Well, I think we could break it down into several groups. Rebels Against Space, for example. Meaning we would insist on New Spaces.

A: To whom would be lodge our request? City planners?

Q: Hell no. We'd go a lot farther than that. We'd appeal to the Space Mafia.

A: Who are they?

Q: People who make space and sell it. They control the market.

A: So we'd have to raise money to buy new space from them.

Q: No, we'd threaten them by saying we're ready to make our own.

A: And how would our own be different?

Q: It wouldn't be continuous. It wouldn't require time, for example, to move across a chunk of it. You could just disappear from one end and reappear at the other.

A: I'd think there would be a market for that. The military would be very interested.

Q: Yeah, but we're not selling to them. Our market would be the people who want a break from ordinary reality. Billions of people. Of course, they can get that break if they go to a museum and look at paintings for a long time. But they don't know that. They think they're hemmed in.

A: You've talked about art as a flood.

Q: Yeah. Flooding the world with so much art that perception of reality changes. It would take a while for it to sink in, but when it did, all sorts of new phenomena would surface.

A: I'd guess that telepathy would expand terrifically. People would get used to space on a different level—not as something you have to travel through, but as a medium. A fluid, maybe. Or better yet, a definition of position. Space simply tells you where you are. It doesn't tell you what you have to do to go from one position to another. You can transmit thoughts as easily as driving to the market. Easier.

Q: The point is, once you realize that telepathy is very available, the character of thought begins to escalate, because why bother to exchange messages with someone when the thoughts involved are so pedestrian? "I'm going to the movies. Want to go?" "Sure." I mean, who would care about that? [Apparently, I was wrong, because now we have instant Twitter, and people are comfortable sharing the most inane messages.—JR]

A: So you're saying art would come into its own with telepathy.

Q: Yes, in the form of new languages. Many new languages, where the symbols aren't denoting specific meanings. They're open. You get the aesthetic punch, but you leave out the literal. When people are confronted by art at every turn, adventurous art, and when they begin creating it, too, they need to become far more inventive. I'd compare it to a situation where you have a lot of land—lots of people have a lot of empty land—and you grow vegetables. And then you have enough for your needs, and so does everyone else. So what are you going to do now? You're going to plant flowers, maybe. You're going to step into art. You're going to escalate. See, on a mental level, people are involved with thought-forms all the time. These are like pictures, but they're not exactly pictures. They're more like feelings. They have the impact of sensation and feeling. But at the same time, take these people and lead them into a museum, into a room where abstract paintings are hanging all over the place, and they claim to be baffled. Absolutely baffled. It's ridiculous. It's like saying people who own cars go to a garage where a hundred cars are parked and they have no idea what they're seeing.

A: I'd be in favor of forcing people to live in a museum for a few years. I think some interesting things would happen. They can't go outside. They have to stay in the museum.

Q: Well, people used to talk about the effect of space on astronauts. This would be like that. Here in the museum, there are hundreds of vastly different realities hanging on the walls, and people see them every hour of every day. Eventually, I think they'd stop their incessant whining about not understanding art, and they'd actually begin to look at what's on the walls. They'd become involved. They'd realize people have been sending advanced "messages" to one another for centuries.

A: If you were a citizen of ancient Egypt, and you went to sleep and had a dream, my sense is that, when you woke up, you'd be required to seek out an interpretation of the dream from a so-called expert.

Q: Just like now.

A: (laughs) Yeah. You'd go to a local priest who was trained in the accepted cosmology—all the gods and sub-gods, and sub-sub gods, the cosmology that tells you all about their functions and histories and powers...and you'd have this priest tell you what your dream meant. He'd give you the party line, in terms of that cosmology, and you'd wander away with the standard party line.

Q: And after a while, you would lose the passion for your own dreams, once you became bored with the cosmology, because what else would you have? There was a complex picture of the universe, and only the priests understood it, and they gave you the chapter and the verse. It was really an anti-art movement. Art is your own. It isn't some communal culture, despite what the wardens of culture tell us.

A: People are afraid of individual meaning.

Q: They want that shared porridge, handed to them by the people who have so-called special insight. Eventually, this devolves down to a feeling that only the initiated understand anything profound. And then the next phase is complete disinterest or open hostility toward art, unless it imitates physical reality. So imagination goes to sleep. The big sleep. And then people say they don't understand anything that isn't practical.

A: This is where waking life becomes hypnosis.

Q: What did you just say? People are afraid of individual meaning. They think that if everyone has his own meanings, there won't be any basis for understanding. They think this means isolation, even insanity. But it's just the opposite. If everyone was transmitting meanings of his own, intensely his own, the level of understanding would rise—because the drabness would be taken out of it, as well as all the false pretension that something horrendously boring is interesting. All that would be gone, wiped off the board. That's what the flood of art would bring. The character of space and time would change. The drabness of repeating space and time would drain away. People think that going into outer space is so fantastic, and it is, but along the way you pass through interminable stretches where there is nothing but nothing. Space just keeps repeating over and over. It's completely redundant.

A: I've seen this with some patients. When they're in trance, it appears that nothing is there. You ask for things, and you get empty space or a vacuum. It goes on and on. I take this as a kind of...coefficient of non-creation. The person isn't creating anything. But it's not by clear choice. It's not like he's sitting in the Big Void and realizing his potential power. It's like narcosis.

Q: Amnesia. In those empty spaces, he's convinced that his creations would only be replicas of what already exists, so he opts out. It's like watching people fall asleep in church. They're in their seats listening to a third-rate recitation of a chunk of a cosmology that is already centuries old and nobody really cares about it...and they fall asleep. It's nothing listening to nothing. What is the sound of no hands clapping? A snore.

A: I'm against instant comprehension. With TV, people know right away what's passing across the screen. Do you see? They sit there for hours watching these images, and they become trained to expect that they'll understand everything they see right away. But with art, you have to become engaged. Actively engaged. You have to work at it. People are losing this faculty. It's the same with certain ideas. People want ideas laid out for them, nice and neat. If ideas show up that don't admit to instant understanding, people walk away.

Q: That's why I say people have to live in an atmosphere of art. They'll reject everything at first, but gradually they'll start to get used to it. They'll absorb it. Then they'll start exploring it. Then they'll start to create it.

A: There is a parallel to hypnotherapy. People think it's something like sleep, but if it's done right, what you really get is focus. Concentration on a specific thing. You put a patient in a situation where he can actually look at something. An idea, an image, a desire. You create the atmosphere where that's possible. In a real sense, the history of our times will be seen as a history of distraction. People moving from one thought to another, never really digesting anything along the way.

Q: I'll tell you about a dream I once had. In the dream, I was sitting in a coffee shop talking to a man who had acted in a repertory company for 30 years, with the same group of people. They had done hundreds of different plays and acted in hundreds of different roles. And in that conversation, it came out that this man's immersion in art for 30 years with his group...that man had experienced and created all sorts of effects we would call paranormal. Telepathy, especially. He had a kind of elevated level of thought transference with other people in the company. It happened frequently. But the thing was, they were all used to it. What I mean is, they didn't talk about it and they didn't think about it, and they certainly didn't trumpet it. They didn't really notice it.

A: So you mean they were isolated.

Q: Right.

A: They took it for granted. These "paranormal" effects happen all the time in art. But people overlook it, they don't stop to recognize what's actually happening. Meanwhile, other "scientific professionals" argue about whether anything paranormal is happening in the world or is possible. It's a ludicrous situation, when you stop and think about it. It's right there, under our noses, and still we have-

Q: This slavish devotion to ordinary reality.

A: Yes.

###END###

February 26, 2011

MIND CONTROL

In the early 1990s, Jack and I sat down and discussed his views on mind control. To say the least, Jack presents a very radical interpretation of this subject.

Q: Okay. What's your definition of mind control?

A: It's the belief that your mind and/or its programming is a complex affair that needs to be unraveled a detail at a time.

Q: What?

A: You heard me.

Q: Sounds like you're talking about a general approach to the mind.

A: Think it through.

Q: You made the statement. Clarify it.

A: What makes mind control mind control? What makes any kind of limitation limiting? Do you see? It's the false belief that, in order to undo what has been done, you need to engage in...you need to walk back the way you came. You need to have a set of keys that allows you to unlock all the doors that have been locked in sequence.

Q: Okay. I get it.

A: This is what stops people. The real control factor is what they believe they need to do in order to undo what they believe has been done to them.

Q: And that's-

A: That's the cardinal factor of mind control. See, take a person's life. He goes through all sorts of experiences. He has a few traumas or whatever. He buys some crazy ideas other people are selling. And so forth and so on. Now, he wakes up a little, and he wants to throw away all that and start fresh. But he thinks he has to enter into a systematic undoing of whatever negative energies and ideas he has picked up. Now he's really stymied. Because he's looking at mind as if it's a closet hung very neatly with things, and he believes he has to find a way to unpack the closet one piece at a time. It's a very big closet, he believes. It stretches from Alaska to Mexico.

Q: And you're saying he has a wrong portrait of the mind. To begin with.

A: Right. Mind is much more fluid than that. Mind is not really the problem. The person is the problem.

Q: What about so-called trauma-based mind control? You know, the CIA MKULTRA-type stuff, or the Soviet version. What about that?

A: There are a lot of misconceptions about it. Those bastards used force and drugs. It was basically torture. Now, they might have gotten real cute, in order to create what they said was multiple personalities in a victim. But whatever system of trance or suggestion they employed, it doesn't matter. It only matters if the victim, emerging from it, escaping from it, believes that, in order to undo what was done, he has to unpack the closet, he has to undo, a step at a time, what has been done to him. If he does believe that, you're in a pickle. You now need to bring in a therapist who believes what the victim believes—and together they explore this territory. The therapist offers a complex a system of un-brainwashing that the victim can accept. Based on a shared belief, they can make progress. Here's an analogy. Let's say you're lost in the woods. You've been lost for a month. You're in bad shape. You're eating leaves and roots. You believe the only way to get out is to walk the way you came—which is a complex task. But that's what you think. As long as you think that, what else are you going to do? You might be able to make it work. Maybe. In the same way, a complex system of un-brainwashing might work, but to suggest it's the only or best path is way overstating things.

Q: Some people are predisposed to playing chess.

A: Exactly! They look south and they see chess. They look north and they see chess. You try to sell them checkers or a helicopter and they turn you down flat. They don't believe in that. They believe in chess. If they're lost, you can get them out only if you present your solution so it looks and feels like chess. Otherwise, they refuse.

Q: So for them, chess is mind control.

A: (laughs) Yeah. It's the filter through which they see reality.

Q: And where does THAT come from?

A: That's not mind. That's the person himself. He has chosen that filter and he uses it all the time.

Q: But why did he choose it to begin with?

A: See, we're walking right back into the same trap. Suppose we say there was a long concatenation of events that FORCED this person to choose that filter. Then where are we? We're about to conclude, well, the only way to get rid of the filter is to reconstruct the exact string of events that FORCED him to adopt the filter. To put that whole string under a magnifying glass so he can see it in every detail—and then he can throw away the filter. Which is nonsense. Because when you go back far enough, what you really see is, he chose that filter. He took it and placed it over his eyes. That's what happened. It doesn't matter why. It doesn't matter what reasons he gave himself for choosing it. Sure, he can gain some insight that way, by scoping

out the reasons. But really, he has to find a way to leap beyond that filter and start seeing reality in new and different ways—and then one day, he'll remember the filter and laugh at the whole thing and how silly it was.

Q: What if he can't?

A: Who are you? The devil's advocate?

Q: I'm trying to be.

A: Well, if he can't, he's in the mud. It's like asking me, if a guy is standing on one side of a river that runs from one eternity to another, and he wants to get across, and he refuses to step in the water, how will he succeed? He won't succeed. He'll stand on that riverbank for 50 lives or 300 lives or 50,000 lives, until he jumps in the water.

Q: Understood.

A: You're a painter. So I'll give you an analogy from painting. A painter is in his studio. He's looking at the blank canvas. He has the brush in his hands. His filter is "Renaissance perspective." He believes that everything he paints has to have that kind of perspective in it. But he wants to do something new at the same time. That's his urge. How is going to proceed unless he gets rid of that filter, unless he dares to leap beyond it?

Q: Since anthropology became such a well-known field of study, we've had the premise that cultures have different customs, different filters, and "it's all relative."

A: This is the biggest bunch of baloney going.

Q: Why?

A: Because it assumes that everyone in a given culture has the same filter. Nonsense. When you probe deeper, you find out every person is an individual. But that's not a popular idea anymore. From my work with patients from all over the world, I've satisfied myself that every person has his own filters, which go a lot deeper than cultural artifacts. See, when a person is dreaming at night, he sometimes lets go of those filters. He takes a leap of imagination, and he's out there in a new territory, and he's experiencing things he really wants to experience. And if he remembers what happened when he wakes up in the morning, he feels that exhilaration. He got past the gates. He got past the filters. He was free. And why? Because he created a dream. He imagined his way past the filters. What I do in my work is try to bring that state of affairs into waking life.

Q: Talk a little more about filters.

A: Okay, you've got a person who is involved, in his job, with technology. He's an engineer. He sees things in terms of problems and solutions. Everywhere he looks, there is a problem to solve, and the way to solve it is through rational exercise. Take

a step forward. Formulate a way to make something work a little better. There is nothing wrong with that. Fine. But as his life goes on, he's in that basic position. He's a solver. He sizes up situations as problems, and he works to solve them. It doesn't make him as happy as it once did. That's the main thing. He doesn't get the same kick out of it. Most people would say that's a function of aging, but it really isn't. It's a function of the filter. His filter. His way of approaching reality. You've heard of this word entropy? It's a goofy theory that all over the universe, available energy is running down. It's dissipating. It doesn't disappear, but it's stored in, what could you call it, places of quiet, where nothing is happening. Like a warehouse. Well, what really runs down is a filter. It begins to deteriorate, because the person it belongs to is finding it less and less interesting and exciting. It's like a book he's read a thousand times. How much more can he squeeze out of it? This is what mind control comes down to. Your filter. And the general tendency is for it to deteriorate, which doesn't mean it goes away. It just means it's less useful and interesting, but nothing takes its place. That's the problem. It's a replacement problem. But you see, because this engineer has spent his whole life using that filter, he doesn't see an alternative. He doesn't know what else he can do. He's like a one-trick pony. The trick is wearing out. He looks around for an answer. He looks here and there. He reads a few books. Nothing really clicks. He tries to formulate his own state of mind into a problem he can solve, but he can't really define the problem. Well, how could he? He's looking through the problem. The filter.

Q: And as I've suggested to you many times, the answer is imagination.

A: Yes, and in my work and in your work, the issue is, how do you get a person to make that leap? How do you get him to recognize, first of all, that he has this thing called imagination? How do you get him to use it? How do you open up that whole territory? It takes ingenuity. It isn't just a problem that needs solving. It's a lot different.

Q: People use filters that can't process the fact that you can invent something that wasn't there before.

A: This is true. So that needs to be overcome. You can trick a person into it, but that way has brief results only. You need to go deeper. Higher.

###END###

February 27, 2011

POWER

This interview took place in the fall of 1988. As you can tell, Jack and I tended to jump from one theme to another. Part of the reason was we'd already covered so much ground together, we could anticipate where things were heading.

Q: In all our conversations, we always seem to come around to the subject of imagination.

A: Well, you convinced me, finally, it was of the greatest importance. I was always working with it, but I needed to think more about the wider implications.

Q: Such as imagination creates reality?

A: Yes. So there are an infinite number of possible realities. That perspective gives you a different view of the world.

Q: In your work, do you ever approach the issue of power directly?

A: Early in my career, I tried that, but it didn't work.

Q: Why not?

A: Because my patients were shy about that or afraid.

Q: Even under hypnosis?

A: Yes.

Q: That's interesting.

A: I thought so. It taught me something. People tend to have a taboo about the whole thing. They go through all sorts of contortions about power. I could see that clearly.

Q: What kind of contortions?

A: Well, it's like pin the tail on the donkey or musical chairs. Where you put power. To whom or what do you attribute it? See, people know power exists. But it's not something they admit they want. So they go around in a very circuitous route to pin it somewhere else. The sky has power. Wind has power. The Earth has power.

Q: In recent culture, the word power has taken on a distinctly negative meaning. It's been conclusively associated with corruption, oppression, and criminal activity.

A: Pop psychology gives the word a slightly different twist, as in "personal power." The context is often "taking back your power," which assumes that, somewhere along the line, someone else had control over you—and now you're recapturing it.

But at best, this diluted vision implies that, from now on, you'll be able to make your own decisions. That's pretty weak.

Q: Power means you can DO. It means you are able. From a Latin root.

A: Let's go far out. Suppose you want to do something that is thought to be impossible? Suppose you want to read a person's thoughts from ten miles away? Or you want to move an object on your desk with your mind? Suppose you want to levitate. There is a general consensus that these paranormal feats of power are impossible. In fact, the consensus weaves together with the fabric of the space-time continuum. One aspect is dependent on the other. Consider the image of two mirrors standing across from each other. The reflections bounce back and forth. One feeds the other. In the same way, the general consensus that levitation is impossible nourishes the "rule of the physical continuum" which states that unaided human levitation is verboten. Let's shift the focus. Let's say there is a manuscript in a museum. It has been dated at 4300 BC. For over a century, scholars, linguists, and cryptologists have tried to understand the rows of symbols—and they have utterly failed. They haven't made a single inroad. Now you look at it. You stand in front of it and look at it for an hour. Do you think your imagination will swing into gear? Damn right it will. You'll start imagining all sorts of "paranormal" possibilities—even though you can't name them or describe them. Your imagination will go to places that aren't pedestrian. This is what happens with a mystery. The mind, the imagination begins to write script, and the script is about realities that are beyond what we ordinarily think about. The imagination is waiting in the bushes, for an opportunity to come out and stretch and get beyond this humdrum continuum. That's a natural tendency, which we keep under wraps.

Q: To understand power, you need imagination.

A: Otherwise, you just think about power in terms you already understand. You repeat yourself. You become bored.

Q: You use the word boredom a lot.

A: That's because it's the bottom line on the accounting book called Reality. That's what you finally get to. Reality bores. Power is about exceeding reality. When you stop and think about it, why didn't humans imbue their gods with no power at all? Why should gods have power at all? They could be farmers tilling the soil or stone masons. The gods have power because human imagination gives it to them. And that happens because humans need to imagine power somewhere. They're afraid to give it to themselves, so they invent the gods. This is another deflection of the truth on to spaces where it's "safe" to attribute power. The taboo is: we have power.

Q: In modern times, we have comic books and super-heroes. Superman. Batman. In ancient Greece, another super-hero, Prometheus, stole fire from the gods and gave it to man. Fire is energy. Energy is a function of imagination. Prometheus stole awareness of creative power and gave it to humans. Power starts with imagining power.

A: But Superman doesn't try to figure out a way to give his kind of power to humans. That never happens. Several years ago, I met with a man who was trying to start a school. He had this idea. He'd cram grades one through twelve into eight years, and the other four would be nothing but art. All day, all the time. Students doing art. All the arts.

Q: What happened?

A: He could never raise the money. People were afraid of what he was talking about. Immersion in the arts to the point where a reality shift would take place in the minds of the kids. I mean, that's what he talked about, so his potential investors dried up. They disappeared into the fog. Art is about walking right up the ladder of power. An artist has power. Even if there is no consensus about that. Consensus is the last thing that happens.

Q: Energy is a function of imagination. We've talked about that before.

A: I'd liken it to a very dark night. You're wandering around. You don't know exactly where you are. Then you see a glint of light ahead. Suddenly, you feel an injection of energy. You feel it. THAT'S the way to get out. When you imagine something new, and you feel it, you get that shot of energy. It's a potentially endless supply. The old nonsense about entropy [dissipating energy] is a wrong concept.

Q: Why not another kind of theory: there are multiple universes pouring energy and receiving energy from one another. The process just keeps going.

A: If there's one thing we don't have a lack of, it's energy.

Q: So is that how you approach the issue of power with patients?

A: Energy through imagination. And when a person experiences enough energy, he begins to know he has power.

Q: In traditional alchemy, in their cross, the four ends represented the four elements of nature [earth, air, fire, water]. Where the two sticks meet, in the center—that's called Quintessence. This is the quality that can resolve the conflict among the four elements. The Quintessence is imagination.

A: It would be, because it is the thing that gets you beyond the four elements. It puts you out there beyond the inhibiting rules of nature. This whole resurrection of the nature religion that started in the 1960s—it was supposed to be about resolution and peace, but—

Q: The factor they left out of the equation was imagination. They substituted drugs for imagination.

A: I had a patient who, in a light trance, would invent dream after dream. That's what I had him do. He must have fabricated fifty dreams altogether, over the over a period of a few months. In every one of those dreams, he put in a power source.

Some god or entity that had great power. And then one day, he got a different kind of message. From the sheer invention of these dreams, he was getting a whole lot of energy. He was feeling that. Then it began to dawn on him that he had power. And from then on, the character of the dreams he invented was different. And in his life, he knew he had power.

###END###

March 1, 2011

A UNIQUE OBJECT

This interview with Jack took place, to the best of my memory, in the summer of 1990. Reconstructing it from my notes, I see Jack is describing one of many ways he worked with patients to move them into “a new way of seeing.”

Q: Why is it important to allow your patients to see “beyond ordinary reality?”

A: The answer to that is, of course, obvious. But I’ll try to give you a slightly different slant on it. You could say that everything a person believes or is conditioned to believe is held in place, held in one place, like a corral. The sheep in the corral are all his beliefs, and they stand there. There is a fence around the corral, and the gate is locked by the way he views reality. As long as he views reality in the same way, the gate is going to be locked. And his beliefs are going to remain there. They’re not going to change. But if, for some reason, he begins to see reality in a new way, the lock on the gate is going to spring open, and the beliefs are going to scatter and disperse.

Q: So, in hypnotherapy, you try to get patients to-

A: Not through suggestions, but by other strategies.

Q: For example?

A: With certain patients who I feel are up to it, I bring in the idea of a unique object.

Q: What’s that?

A: A unique object, for my purposes, is a one-of-a-kind thing that never existed before and will never exist again. It could be anything.

Q: There are lots of unique objects.

A: Depends on how you look at that meaning. I’m talking about a thing that isn’t composed of whatever everything else is composed of. So a unique object isn’t made out of atoms. It’s different.

Q: Like a very strange chair?

A: Why not? It could be anything. But it’s utterly unlike anything else.

Q: Not sure I follow you.

A: I put a patient in a light trance. That means he’s aware, and it also means he can focus. His mind is, for the moment, uncluttered. He’s not thinking fifteen thoughts. He’s in a sort of zero state. Calm. He can think and he can respond, but he’s not

distracted. His consciousness is relaxed and open. He's not overly receptive to suggestions. He's not in a Pavlovian condition. He's in the moment.

Q: Okay. Then what?

A: Then I describe, in general terms, what a unique object is. And I ask him to conceive of one.

Q: Does he?

A: It varies. Some people work at it but they don't come up with anything. Other people give me lots of objects, but nothing much happens. In some cases, though, a very interesting thing occurs. The patient begins to see or imagine or think about a truly unique thing. An object of great significance to him. It's not me who is telling him the object has great meaning. He comes upon that by himself. It's all subjective. You see? I give them the general idea of what a unique object is, and then he takes it from there. And what he describes to me isn't a startling revelation, in terms of the object itself. It's how he sees it and how he feels about it. It's like trying to catch lightning in a bottle. When it happens, the patient experiences a change in perception. Right away.

Q: Because he feels he's really seeing something unique.

A: That's right. He feels that. You know, people go through their lives and they see all sorts of things, and nothing much registers with any great impact. It's often just cultural responses, like, "Well, I'm standing here on top of a mountain, and I'm supposed to be enthralled, so I'll act like I am." Or "I'm walking through a forest and I'm supposed to feel the majesty of the tall trees, so I will." My idea is to have a patient actually experience something in a spontaneous way.

Q: Give me an example.

A: One patient was quiet for a long time. Then he began talking slowly about...it seemed to be a musical instrument. He got this look in his eye, as if he was feeling something he had never felt before. As if he was making a real discovery. As if this object wasn't part of the known world.

Q: And then what?

A: The next day, he told me his blood pressure, which had been high, was down to normal levels. His low-level chronic headache was gone. He didn't need his glasses.

Q: Was this change permanent?

A: The blood pressure never went all the way back to the high level. For about a week, he didn't need his glasses. The chronic headache eventually became a once-a-month headache. But he also began to see his life differently. His marriage really underwent a revolution. He reconciled with his wife, and they became much happier. His overall mood changed.

Q: All from...

A: From that experience.

Q: And you would say his beliefs changed.

A: Absolutely. Until that point, he had a very restricted view of his possibilities. That all shifted.

Q: Because he glimpsed a unique object.

A: It sounds strange, doesn't it. But yes. It was a moment in a session. The "gap" between what he believed and what he could see just...fell apart. Here's how I would characterize it. Perception is often an apparatus where you have whole strings of things that are deemed to be similar. The person sees A and subconsciously thinks, "Well, A is like B and B is like C and C is like D..." He's not really seeing A. He's linking A to other things he's seen or heard about. It's not true vivid perception. It's perception plus memory and thought. It's a hybrid. And it's dull. It's really uninteresting. Which has emotional implications. The person's level of feeling becomes dull, too. So what happened in this case with the patient was, that whole pattern was broken. For a few minutes, the perception, the seeing was direct. He saw a unique object. Or to put it differently, he saw uniquely.

Q: And what caused his beliefs to change?

A: Well, if perception is dull, feeling is dull. If feeling is dull, then a person begins to adopt beliefs that will go along with that level of dull feeling. Limited beliefs. Limited ideas about the possibility of his life and even existence itself. So when that whole pattern broke apart, the sun came through. He perceived uniquely. He did it himself. Not through my suggestions. Not through drugs. He did it. And so, automatically, his dull beliefs began to slip away, because there was nothing to hold them in the corral.

Q: He perceived uniquely, so he felt uniquely, and then his beliefs, which were based on, as you say, dull feelings, were unsupported.

A: Right. Life tends to form into an un-unique pattern. That's what characterizes it. The un-uniqueness is the glue that holds the pattern together. When you melt that glue, you get a chance at liberation.

Q: This reminds me of preconceived knowing. A person has a set of assumptions, and then anything he comes across—information, ideas, concepts—he fits them into the assumptions he already has and...grinds out a conclusion about whether these ideas are of value or not.

A: Yes, it's the same thing, but what I do with patients relates to direct perception. Direct spontaneous experience.

[At this point, we took a long break. When we came back, we continued the conversation. Jack reiterated some of things he'd been saying, adding a few twists.]

Q: You were talking about political structures.

A: Yes. They are built in relation to public blindness.

Q: What does that mean?

A: To the degree that people think they are blind to what is going on in the world, the political structures that act on their behalf become larger.

Q: Governments are people's eyes?

A: Absolutely. So the more complex the world becomes, the more people think they are blind, and they allow governments to expand. The formula works from both ends. Government is an apparatus of perception.

Q: Of course, what governments "see" is colored by their agendas.

A: Sure. I didn't say the government is a reliable set of eyes. I just said it substitutes for people's blindness. It's second-hand perception. But I bring it up because it's very much like what happens within an individual.

Q: How so?

A: A person tends to believe he can't see what's really going on, in front of his own eyes. This comes about because of disappointments the person suffers. He sees something and he wants it, and he tries, but he doesn't get it. So he begins to believe there is something wrong with the way he sees.

Q: That's a strange idea.

A: Yes, but it's true. People start out with a simple formula—if I can see it and I want it, I can get it. When that formula doesn't work enough times, the person begins to believe he isn't seeing correctly. So he enters into a complex process with his mind, where he appoints a structure, an internal structure to see for him.

Q: A proxy.

A: Yes. And this structure is based on comparisons. A is like B, and B is like C, and C is like D. A person begins to see in categories. He doesn't perceive directly. Instead of seeing A directly and uniquely, he sees the things A is compared to. He sees a concept. And he gets into cultural norms, seeing what the culture tells him he is supposed to see.

Q: You're talking about a habit.

A: A deeply ingrained habit.

Q: Aside from the technique of “the unique object,” how would it be broken?

A: You’re the one who told me how.

Q: Through imagination.

A: Yes. Because imagination throws a monkey wrench into the apparatus of second-hand perception. It doesn’t go along with A is like B and B is like C. It comes from a different place. I once did an experiment with ink blots. You know, the ink blot test psychologists use. I took a small group of people and told them I wanted them to look at a few cards with ink blots on them and write down what they could imagine when they saw them. It was all imagination. The people knew that. So first, they wrote down a number, before they looked at any of the cards. The number represented their estimate of their “feeling of well-being” at that moment. It was a scale from 1 to 20, with 20 being highest. Then, after I showed them the cards, and they spent about an hour writing down what they imagined...they wrote down another number—their state of well-being at THAT moment. And in all cases, the second number was higher than the first. The well-being index. (laughs) Imagination raises the level of emotion. It raises energy. And it creates perception. That’s the most important thing. So, essentially, imagination shreds the apparatus of second-hand perception by creating new perception.

Q: The culture isn’t set up to accommodate that.

A: The culture is all about showing people what they’re supposed to see, through sets of definitions and categorizations. That’s what a culture IS. An apparatus of perception. Imagination works at cross purposes to that.

Q: Because imagination doesn’t care what the culture says or thinks.

A: Right. When you imagine something, you see it right away. You see what you imagine. Your perceive THAT. So it’s a different way of seeing.

Q: And it only applies to the individual.

A: Of course. As soon as it becomes a group enterprise, you’re building a culture. You’re building another second-hand perception apparatus.

###END###

March 3, 2011

MORE ON DREAMS

These are remarks from Jack made during a 1987 conversation we had. I present them as fragments from my notes.

"The overall situation a patient might find himself in, over a period of time...His emotions and thoughts are stymied. They're frozen, in a way. He may be doing well or poorly in his life. It doesn't matter. The situation is negative, in the sense that he doesn't believe he can make progress in his own terms. He may not even know what his own terms are."

"Despite his successes and victories, it all feels temporary, in retrospect. He keeps coming back to the situation. The unyielding rock. I've had patients, for example, who have been through many spiritual efforts to achieve greater consciousness—and they have had remarkable experiences...but then it all seems to fade away, and they're back at the rock. As they get older, the situation hardens. A part of them is resigned. So the situation, the negative trend is very dense, you could say. It's firm."

"...A dream in which he becomes a master over space and time. Would inventing such a dream release energies which are bottled up? Would it make him feel better? ...Then I have him invent other dreams—traveling to other dimensions, for instance. Dreams that get him past physical reality and its rules in other ways. An important part of what I do is decide what will work with different people. It's not all the same for everyone. You have to understand that."

"In myths, the gods can bring worlds into being, and they can take them out of being. They can rearrange reality. They can operate well beyond all the slaves who are trapped in a narrow context of reality. And these myths represent a human longing. It's not just attributing certain qualities to gods. It's wanting to be like gods. These are the terms of the myths. So you can simply dismiss all this as inconsequential fantasizing, or you can look further into it and see that these so-called godlike capacities are what humans think about subconsciously."

"The subconscious is usually thought to contain repressed anti-social material. Well, if you adjust that notion a little bit, what's more anti-social than being able to exceed the rules of time and space? You see? This carries us out far beyond traditional psychological concepts. This takes us into the underpinning of whole cultures. A culture is the reverse of what human beings really yearn for. It's the dark side of the moon. A culture is an average. It's the dream repressed. A culture is a thing people want to escape from. A culture, by its very nature, is defeatist. What's in the subconscious is the desire to go past the rules of the continuum in which we live. To travel through time, for example. To go forward and back. Impossible, right? Well, that's the sort of thing I find in the subconscious. So I have a choice. I can say it's buried deep because it's a fantasy of no importance that doesn't belong in the world, or I can say it's the key. I can say it represents the desire to climb to a higher level. And when I do that, and when I bolster it by having

patients, in a light trance, invent dreams that support it, the patients get better. They experience well-being. They heal. They become more powerful in their lives. They become freer. And I DON'T mean they become healthier because they give up those dreams and fit in—I mean they step on to the path of magic."

"A child grows up with a certain standard of beauty. It isn't drilled into his head. He sees what's around him and his feelings tell him what's beautiful and what's ugly. But then, at a certain age, there is a chance that he realizes something new. What he sees as beautiful isn't really doing him any good. It's becoming a little boring. But instead of exploring that idea, he shoves it under the rug because it feels too odd. He goes back to claiming what he felt was beautiful as a child is beautiful now. But he doesn't quite feel the same way about it anymore. "Beautiful" is becoming a kind of category, to which he pays lip service. He is now beginning to perceive through a category. He's sort of doing it by the numbers. He's doing it by rote. Old categories of perception tend you hold you back. If you're seeing based on what you're supposed to see and feel, you're cutting yourself off from energy, from creative power."

###END###

March 8, 2011

TIME AND SPACE

In this conversation, from 1990, Jack discusses the space-time continuum.

Q: How does hypnotic trance relate to space-time?

A: That's a question I've looked into for years. First of all, all trances are not equal. I have my own way of putting people into a light trance, which isn't deep enough for suggestions to have any effect. It's about getting a patient into a place where he is able to focus clearly without any distractions. But there is something else, too. In this state of mind, he's not tied so closely to physical reality. He's aware of it, but he's floating. He's a bit removed from its influence. He's not so much a slave to it. He's, you could say, in a different space, and a different time.

Q: He's in a dream state?

A: Not quite. More like a pre-dream state, just before a dream begins.

Q: Does this have something to do with why sleep is so important?

A: Well, sleep is necessary for several reasons. But in this sense, it's important because the shackles that tie a person to physical-reality space and time are unhooked. He can go elsewhere.

Q: And why does that matter?

A: Because the space-time continuum is just one reality. And at some level, a human being knows this. That's the point, you see. He knows this. And he doesn't want to stay glued to that one reality. Why should he? There are lots of other places to go. And those places, in certain respects, are far more interesting and fulfilling.

Q: You keep coming back to this theme.

A: I have to. It's central. Desire precedes reality.

Q: That's an interesting way to put it.

A: It's accurate. So if a person becomes all wound up in this continuum—which of course he does—than he loses sight of what? Desire. Because it seems then that reality defines what can be legitimately desired. Everything is backwards. Desire becomes diluted and blunted. And that's when people lose power.

Q: There is pressure to desire something you can make and sell.

A: Yes, and that's a culture that reflects this obsession with "the one and only reality." If you desire to create something that maybe other people can't understand and won't buy...well, reality-governing-desire steps in and says ARE YOU CRAZY? People think they make no sacrifice by adjusting their desires, but they do. They

build up frustration. They accumulate stress. They want to break out. They're told they need to grow up and act like everyone else—but that's not it. The space-time continuum and gravity and the way energy works and all the rest of it...in one sense, it's hype. Pure hype. It's a message that says: you can't go against the laws. You can't move into other dimensions. But think about music. You can create any tempo you want to. You can make a whole new space or series of spaces. You're inventing space and time. It's right there. People just don't want to follow the implications.

Q: Is the mind in some way married to this continuum?

A: I don't think so. Does your mind keep you from breaking some rule? At bottom, YOU do. It isn't something like a mechanism of mind, although that would make a good science fiction story. It's you. But when I work with a patient, at some point he realizes that I don't care about any of that. He can float right off the chair and it's fine with me. He can disappear and reappear in London, and that's okay with me. A kind of partnership develops in that way with some of my patients, and it makes a great deal of difference.

Q: In that sense, you're like the patient's subconscious.

A: Yes, that's right. In his subconscious, he has all sorts of desires that involve going beyond this continuum—and that's the way I am.

Q: None of this involves religion.

A: Religion? That's indefinite postponement.

Q: It's the idea that, in order to reach beyond this continuum, you have to be in debt and you have to be discharging that debt.

A: In what I do, there is no owing. No one is beholden to me for anything.

Q: Do you see space and time of this universe as being connected?

A: I think that's a hoax. Space is curved and space and time merge in some way? What? I don't see it. It just seems like apples and oranges. A distraction. A diversion. A confusion that adds to the problem. Maybe it's a way of expressing a latent desire to become a master of space and time. But time is all about duration...and space is a stage set. Just because space and time are integrated in equations doesn't mean they actually merge. Would you say that the men in a rocket are merged with the fuel in the engines? Poetically, maybe. But physically? No.

Q: Let's get back to this partnership you mentioned, between you and the patient.

A: It's a key. The reason I'm tapping into his very deep desires to go beyond the space-time continuum is because I understand that. It's not just a "therapeutic device." It's me. Suppose a patient tells me he sees an astral location and he describes it. I could discount that and move on. But of course I don't, because I

KNOW he's feeling a new power and eagerness welling up in him, he's moving into a place he really wants to be, and I want to be in a place like that, too. I want to go exploring. I keep saying this in different ways, but...it has everything to do with repressed desire, on a level that is immense. At that level, the person is all about going beyond the reality defined by this universe. It isn't just a passing fancy. We all have this tendency to say, "Well, it's raining today, so we can't go outside." But underneath that, we don't care. Rain is not a problem. We don't care about the excuses we give ourselves. We want more. We want to experience magic. You see, think about Freud. He had a propensity to define repression in terms of sex. That was where he was tuning in. He made a life out of that. That was the level of repressed desire he was looking at. I'm talking about something that is buried much deeper in the psyche, in the subconscious. To turn away from it would be absurd. To turn away and say, well, that's not real, that's not doable, that's not a subject for therapy...why would you do that? It's staring you right in the face. It's there. So the first thing a person needs to do is admit he has this desire for magic, for going past all the supposed limits of this physical reality. He has to see and feel that desire in himself.

Q: Are space and time powerful inhibitors and limiters?

A: I prefer to think of them as delusions.

Q: In what sense?

A: Let's say you're in a car and you're driving along a road. The road is very long. It seems never to end. You keep driving. You believe this road is the only one. You think if you're driving, you're on that road. Where else would you be? But of course, there are a million other roads. And-

Q: You can invent roads, too.

A: Yes.

Q: The subconscious knows this?

A: For my purposes, in my work, the subconscious is a generalized term that indicates an interior place where a repressed desire of great proportions is kept under wraps.

Q: What's real versus what's delusional—that's a tricky subject.

A: Yeah. Part of the reason is semantic. You're using the words in different ways. On one level, physical reality, space and time are very real. But we foster a delusion by thinking they're the only space and time. On another level, space and time are invented—they're not just "there." This is the subject of a great deal of myth, which is an attempt to understand who made the continuum. And, as with any unsettled argument, some people will step in and try to use the situation for their own benefit. But in the meantime...musicians make their own space and time, which is different

from the continuum, and you can see by the response of the audiences that this invention has great power and desire associated with it...with music, people are responding to a new universe that is being created.

Q: The creative is the trump card.

A: The energy of it is-

Q: Unlimited.

A: Yes.

###END###

April 26, 2011

THE TITANIC FUTURE

The interview was conducted in 1991.

Jack never tried to talk down to people. He let fly with his deepest insights, no matter how revolutionary or complex. He always laid it all on the line.

Q: What was it you were saying before we sat down?

A: The major fact of our time is that there are large numbers of people who have freed themselves from the prison of ideologies and fundamentalisms. They just don't know where to go next. At some level of mind, they're considering magic.

Q: The basic confusion surrounding this subject [magic] hasn't been well articulated. It comes down to a question: is magic a space you enter, or is it something you create?

A: You just said a mouthful. Let's get to that later. Meanwhile, I want to talk about experiences I've had with patients.

Q: Go ahead.

A: With a surprising number of people, under hypnosis, we find that they already have a picture of the future.

Q: Their own future?

A: Well, yes, but it's more than that. They have a vision of the future of the planet.

Q: You mean an opinion about the future?

A: No. This is much bigger than that. It's as if the whole future, like a big chunk of reality, is just sitting there, in their subconscious. They had no idea it was there until they bumped into it.

Q: Like a—

A: Like a whole novel. A book. The future. It feels to them like precognition. It's knowledge about what hasn't happened yet.

Q: Really.

A: Yes.

Q: Each one has a "book" about the future? Each book is different?

A: See, if we suppose that somewhere there is a record of past, present, and future, what some people call, for example, the Akashic Records, what's the assumption?

Q: What do you mean?

A: What's the common assumption about what these records reveal?

Q: You tell me.

A: The assumption is these future events are laid out, they're described, they're revealed. You know, THIS will happen, and then THAT will happen.

Q: Well, sure.

A: No. Something is wrong with that. I think people have been misinterpreting what the Akashic Records are all about. They're taking too narrow a view. They're looking through narrow filters.

Q: And if you take off the filters?

A: You see hundreds of different equally-convincing futures sitting there, side by side. That's what's in the Records. Not just one future. And what I'm saying is...

Q: The exact same situation is mirrored in your patients.

A: You bet. Exactly. In other words, the Akashic Records are really distributed in the subconscious mind of people. That's where they are. It's a whole vast library.

Q: Keep going.

A: This is the hard part. You have to be there with a patient, when he's under hypnosis, to see and experience and feel how CONVINCING his "book of the future" is. It's quite fantastic. It isn't some little dribbling thing about what's going to happen fifty years from now. It's titanic. It's as if you came across a whole block of hidden treasure in the patient's subconscious. There it is, undisturbed, in a cave. No dust on it. It's pristine and very detailed. And when the patient describes it, it just rolls out. It's a river of information.

Q: That's pretty spectacular.

A: Here's what I've found with some patients. They're already living in the "book of the future" that's in their subconscious. They already have a role in that future.

Q: Even though they're here and now...

A: They're acting in the present according to their role in the future. It sounds weird, I know. But that's what's happening.

Q: That would make a person pretty maladjusted.

A: Yes and no. No, because the power of that "future role" is so strong, they are acting in the present to bring about that future. That's what they're doing.

Q: But they have no idea they're doing it.

A: None. They're totally in the dark. Until they get a look at the future book in their subconscious. Then everything changes for them. Then they open their eyes.

Q: It's funny, you're turning the traditional view of psychology on its head.

A: Yes. Supposedly, what's happened to you in the past has a tremendous influence on how you act in the present. What I'm saying is, the future that's embedded in your subconscious is a much stronger influence on how you act in the present.

Q: It's as if a person has been cast in a stage play that's going to take place in the future.

A: Yes, let's say the play is going to take place four hundred years in the future. But you start acting out that role right now.

Q: So the present is the sum total of all futures?

A: (laughs) Yeah. That's what I was getting to. The present moment in Earth history is the sum total or average of all the futures that are embedded in people's subconscious.

Q: All right. What happens when a person becomes aware he has a whole future embedded in his subconscious mind?

A: He recovers power.

Q: Just like that.

A: When he sees what that future is, a tremendous amount of energy is suddenly available to him. How can I put this? It's as if he has this 5000-piece orchestra in his mind. He doesn't know that, all right? But he's a trumpet player in that orchestra. That's his future role. And in one way or another, perhaps symbolically, he's acting out that role in the present, right now. But because he can't hear the whole orchestra, he doesn't feel the overall power. Then, under hypnosis, he finds the orchestra. He hears the whole thing. NOW the power of that transfers to him.

Q: And what does he do with that power?

A: Yes. That's the key question. The answer is, he has to create with it. There's nothing else he can do with it. That's what the power is for. Here is the catch, the important thing. Now that's he's seen the future embedded in his mind, for the first time, he has a choice. He can use that power to create anything he wants to. It's up to him.

Q: So in hypnosis, you give people the experience of power.

A: That's what I'm doing. That power is magic. And to answer the question you posed, at the beginning, about what magic is, it's not about entering into a space of magic. It's really about creating.

Q: Creating magic.

A: With that power. Yes.

Q: The history of Western philosophy had three basic phases. The first episode was taken up in depicting What Exists as a final Reality. Metaphysics. The second episode shifted the focus to the investigation of how we perceive and know. Epistemology. And the third phase, which has barely begun, involves imagination and creative power—in other words, inventing that which has never existed before.

A: I would agree with that. Creating is magic.

Q: Extraordinary talents and so-called paranormal abilities are actually offshoots of imagination?

A: Talent, which seems to be a native and natural phenomenon, is created by the individual below the threshold of his own conscious mind.

Q: Why does the individual create talent he can't remember creating?

A: (laughs) He wants to be a human being who can do extraordinary things. He doesn't want to step out of the shadows and reveal himself as a magician. Here is the real question: what do you do when you are imagining and creating enough of unique reality that it glides past the eyes of others like a silent and invisible train?

Q: You see the need to bring others to perceive the level at which you're creating.

A: Maybe so. Because if you are creating magic, you will run into many, many, many people who are blind to that. They won't see it. They just won't see it.

Q: Let's get back to this "book of the future" in a person's mind. Any idea where that comes from?

A: I think so, yes. In one sense, and you have to look at this from several points of view...in one sense, the "book" is basically a long-term creation by the person himself, out of bits and pieces.

Q: It doesn't come down from some "higher power."

A: The higher power belongs to the person. But I would go further. In some sense, the person has already been to the future.

Q: Explain that.

A: It's hard to put it into words. It's more than [the person having] an opinion about the future. It's more than [the person engaging in] mere prediction. It's that, plus other factors. It's supernatural or paranormal, for lack of better terms. The person has already been there. He's been to the future. He's gone beyond where it's supposed to be possible to go. It's not just seeing. It's more like traveling. It's a combination of creating and traveling.

Q: That's pretty far-out.

A: Consciousness can travel. Consciousness isn't bounded. It can go anywhere. But we assume that isn't so. We live by other rules.

Q: What do you mean by that last sentence?

A: We're invested in a picture of reality. In that picture, certain things are possible and certain things aren't. We bought stock in a restricted picture of reality.

Q: Why?

A: Well, I could give all sorts of answers to that question. It depends on what level we are looking at.

Q: Level of consciousness?

A: Yes. Consciousness doesn't necessarily see a limited picture of reality as a negative thing. It sees it as an opportunity. A configuration, if you will. You're a painter. You can paint on a tiny canvas or a huge one. Both have their advantages. Do you see? We're able to have different and unique kinds of experiences within this picture of reality that we've bought. We have different options. Even though we're living inside this picture of reality, it's an infinity. There are an infinity of things we can do. It's just, you might say, a different infinity of things than what we could do inside a much larger picture of reality.

Q: So you're saying that, inside this picture of reality we've bought, magic isn't supposed to be possible.

A: I'm sort of saying that, yes. The extreme boundaries [of this picture of reality] are fuzzy. But you see, there are rules and then there are Rules with a capital R. They're different.

Q: How so?

A: Rules with a big R...that would be a final kind of judgment rendered by some external higher power. That would be, "No, you can't do magic in this sphere [picture of reality]." That's not what I mean. That's not the case. We set our own rules. We bought our own picture of reality, this reality, and we set the standards and rules. So we can break them. It's possible. It's going against the grain, but so what? We can do that.

Q: It's like undoing a habit?

A: Yes. For example, we have the habit of stashing what we can't create or are not supposed to create—where do we stash it? In the future. That's where we can put all the things we don't do inside this picture of reality.

Q: Which creates a kind of longing.

A: Yes.

Q: A nostalgia for the future.

A: Right.

Q: And wouldn't you say that, at this point in the history of Earth culture, that longing is increasing?

A: I would. So we have a collective force that is building up for the magic that we have put in the future. That desire is growing.

Q: In that sense, then, the limited picture of reality we've invested in is expanding?

A: Yes. The more important sense of "expanding universe" ...this is what it is.

Q: Can this picture of reality expand to the breaking point?

A: That's what I see.

Q: We've had enough.

A: We're tired of it. We're fed up.

Q: That's a natural outcome?

A: Oh yes. I would say it is.

Q: Because when I look at the history of the arts, that's what I see there. The trend, for some time, has been in the direction of cracking apart the old picture.

A: Sure. I would agree. But you see, in that process, you need people who can understand what, for example, the arts are doing.

Q: Meaning what?

A: You can have, say, a hundred thousand people who are breaking apart the old picture, but what happens if...let me put this another way. When you break apart the old picture, you're changing the modes of perception. That goes along with the breakthrough. You're actually speaking another kind of language, one that has different meanings. And those meanings don't exist inside the old picture of reality. This is crucial to understand.

Q: You're saying that, in order to keep existing inside the old picture, you have to restrict the field or the range of meaning.

A: Absolutely. You see? Inside the picture, you can express a whole range of meanings, but if you go outside that range, it doesn't compute. It doesn't get across. That's one way you actually hold the restricted picture together. You restrict the range of expressions and things that MEAN SOMETHING. People limit their comprehension of meaning. So if you come along and start talking with meanings

that go outside the accepted range, people scratch their heads and shrug and say they don't understand.

Q: As an analogy, it's like the light spectrum.

A: Right. We limit the range of what we can see. So if someone comes along and shows us a wave-length that isn't in the so-called visible spectrum and says, look at this, we say there is nothing there.

Q: It's the same thing with meaning.

A: Yes. We have languages that, by their structure, permit a certain "territory" of meaning. It's big. But it isn't everything. Not by a long shot. And as long as we hold on to these languages for dear life, we're going to claim we have a monopoly on all possible meaning.

Q: And therefore we're going to harden the structure of the picture of reality we've bought into.

A: Yes. It's that structure that's weakening. People are accepting meanings that are borderline. They're stretching their comprehension.

Q: Everything we're talking about here has the ring of a state of hypnosis.

A: It's programming at deep levels.

Q: Self-inflicted.

A: That's what many people find the hardest to accept—that they're hypnotizing themselves.

Q: Hypnotizing themselves into believing that MEANING can only exist within a narrow framework. And everything else is complete gibberish.

A: That's called society. Civilization. That's what you get as the collective outcome. That's why people will sign up for going out and trying to expand various empires through conquest. Because essentially, they'll blame everything else under the sun for the programming they've inflicted on themselves. Of course, it's all done on an unconscious level.

Q: It's been my contention that consciousness creates more consciousness, and in that sense, existence is dynamic. There is no such thing as a "final" state of consciousness.

A: That's a very fertile area. You're going against the idea that there is an ultimate reality.

Q: That's right. Whether you look at reality as something external to us or internal to our state of consciousness, there is no final place where you wind up and discover you've reached the destination.

A: Every experience I've had with patients tells me the same thing. And what we've been discussing here—pictures of reality—that also confirms it for me.

Q: We buy this picture of reality, because living inside it, we can create more and new consciousness, consciousness that never existed before.

A: Every reality affords the same opportunity. People have the wrong idea about infinity. They say, for example, that there is a state of infinite consciousness—but you see, that's really like saying you have all the consciousness there is to have. That's not so. You never have it all, because you create it, and creation has no limit.

Q: Infinite consciousness isn't like some gigantic coat you can slip on. It doesn't already exist.

A: No. We keep creating it.

Q: This limited picture of reality we live in—how long can it last?

A: As long as we want it to.

Q: But the individual doesn't have to wait for everyone else to break out. He can exit from the picture.

A: Sure. But other people won't necessarily understand he's escaped.

Q: Because other people are still loyal to all the restrictions they've programmed into themselves.

A: It's a tug of war. Old meaning versus new meaning. Science, for all its advances, is still basically married to old meaning. Old ways of formulating language.

Q: Old meaning has a kind of structure.

A: It gives birth to many structures, but they all obey the same old rules. They may be fascinating and instructive, but they still obey the old rules that say, "THIS means something, but THAT is meaningless."

Q: I remember a philosophical text called The Meaning of Meaning. It was actually about literary criticism. IA Richards.

A: You can actually analyze "old meaning" and see something about it how operates. For instance, if words describe what exists in the physical world, those words mean something. If you have a sentence that has a subject, verb, and object, the sentence probably means something. But if you have a sentence that obscures or erases the distinction between subject, object, and verb, then that is often called "meaningless." When you stop and think about it, though, why? Why can't we understand and comprehend outside that linguistic structure? The answer is simple. We've HEAVILY programmed ourselves NOT to understand anything outside that structure. We're ABSOLUTELY sure it's meaningless. That's how good the programming is.

Q: So there is a major connection between magic and language.

A: Language, as we usually accept it, is built to rule out magic.

Q: The language we use rules out many possible relationships between things.

A: It also rules out the KINDS of relationships that are possible. See, let's take this example. A man looks at a radio on a table and he focuses on it, and it rises three feet into the air. Most people would say, if there was no trick involved, that was magic. But it's still within the realm of subject, verb, and object. We may not believe the event happened, but we understand what it means. But there is another level of magic, where the basic relationships of subject, verb, and object are gone. New kinds of relationships enter in. We don't have words in our language to describe those relationships. So we don't see them. They're invisible. This would be magic that is invisible to us.

Q: Based on different kinds of relationships.

A: Right.

Q: Then we have people who attempt to explain mysteries by claiming that things we already know about are the cause of that mystery. Like genes.

A: Sure. These scientists try to make their speculations into respectable theories. They'll say that all human behavior is explainable by genes. You have a gene for this and a gene for that.

Q: There is, for example, they'll say, a gene for imagination.

A: Imagination is a mystery to them. They want to explain it away. So they claim a gene controls it. Language does the same sort of thing. It attempts to reduce mysteries down to relationships we're programmed to accept, relationships we're familiar with. But in the process, it misses the magic completely.

Q: You actually see this kind of programming in your patients?

A: All the time. You just have to want to find it. I'm NOT talking about making hypnotic suggestions to people to guide them where you want them to go. All I do is use hypnosis to put them in a light trance where they can focus more clearly. Then we nose around in the interior landscape. We see what's there. Patients encounter their own programming. They encounter...it's not exactly RULES...it's more like cardinal illustrations of the kinds of relationships that are meaningful...it's almost like looking at the simple grammar of our language.

Q: But you don't try to dismantle that programming, do you?

A: Why should I? That would be like saying we should all destroy the English language. Ridiculous. That would be like saying that, in order to teach a person to fly, you lead him out on a cliff, and then you blow up the cliff under him, and then

he'll fly. No, you use the cliff as a platform, and then one way or another, you figure out a way to fly off the cliff into the sky.

Q: Well, if you look at the history of poetry, that's what you see. Poets who use the language to keep stretching "the meaning of meaning." The expansion of meaning and possible relationships between things.

A: Which is why imagination is magic.

Q: I would say that on this planet, imagination is just getting started.

A: I agree. My new experimental ideas about therapy are all in that direction. Getting people to invent realities.

Q: Whereas society is moving in the direction of turning out androids.

A: Societies always do that. It's their bread and butter. They create Reality Soldiers. People dedicated to the picture of reality we're living in. It's the organizing principle.

Q: There are lots of names for that.

A: Doesn't matter what you call it. It's the same pattern. You're trying to organize people. It works up to a certain point, and then it doesn't work anymore. The already limited picture of reality shrinks. It becomes a pressure on the psyche, and the psyche wants to break out.

Q: But people always think that when they break out, they're going to find a super-reality sitting behind ordinary reality.

A: Well, basically, when you break out, you don't find ultimate reality. You find you're the reality. Which makes absolutely no sense at all unless you're creating. You're the center, and you create.

Q: For many people, that's an idea they don't understand.

A: For them, it's an invisible idea. It goes right by them, and they don't notice it.

Q: There are lots of smart people who try to use the limited picture of reality to explain itself.

A: If I understand what you mean, that's like asking an elephant to describe his digestive processes. But let me take that ball and run with it. There are sociologists and psychologists and futurists and computer types, information analysts, who try to make predictions about the future based on the concept that events and people are in a meaningful flux. They document trends. They see what seem to be random occurrences as moving toward a meeting place, where they will combine to produce an important change. They factor in all sorts of aspects, from earthquakes and weather to population shifts, to the innovation of new technology, to political

developments, to what is happening in markets, and so on—all these factors—and then they make their predictions.

Q: They believe in Pattern.

A: Well, that's the whole point. They believe the background context of the picture of reality contains moving parts that conspire to produce change, sometimes momentous change. They might not admit it, but they think the conspiracy of these moving parts is inherent in reality itself. They, the researchers, are searching out these relevant moving parts, and they're pretending to see how the flux is coming to a place where the parts collide and make something very important happen. What's significant is that these people are smart, they're in good jobs, they're listened to, and they constitute a kind of elite. They are opinion leaders, you might say.

Everyone thinks they're a "new intelligentsia." This is the supposed cutting edge of knowledge. It's a cultural phenomenon that these futurists have risen to the top of the heap. Here's what is basically happening: by assuming that there IS some inherent pattern in the ways things work in this picture of reality, by assuming that this pattern comes together at certain moments to produce THE FUTURE, we have a new class of people who are, actually, RE-ENFORCING THE PICTURE OF REALITY WE'RE ALL LIVING IN. While other people are breaking apart the picture, these futurists are shoring it up. And I think you're going to see a lot more from these so-called experts...because the Reality Soldiers are becoming more desperate. They feel the ground rumbling under their feet. They sense that the cluster of Old Meaning is breaking apart and new meanings are leaking in. They don't want that to happen, so they're floating a spurious science of prediction, they're claiming that the picture of reality can tell us "all about reality"...but that is a sham. It's not true.

Q: Fake science is being invented all over the place to cement in the old picture of limited reality. The dam is breaking, and these people are trying to patch it up.

A: Yes. You can see that everywhere. For example, in the area you cover as a reporter, health and medicine, the old picture is disintegrating. People are realizing that disease can be best understood by taking into account the whole body, not just one piece here and one piece there. And if you take into account the whole body and the whole person, the picture of reality gets bigger, and what passed for correct assessment in the past is outmoded. This is viewed as a threat. So researchers keep inventing fake diseases and mental disorders to try to keep the old picture in place. And they're failing. I think that's also true on a larger scale. I hope we're going to see extremes of new meaning leaking in all over. Then we'll see some magic.

###END###

May 8, 2011

ELITE GLOBAL CONTROL

Shortly after the news announcement on May 1, 2011, that “Osama bin Laden had been killed”, readers sent me a Prison Planet story in which Dr. Steve Pieczenik asserts he knows bin Laden is dead, he died in 2001. Pieczenik states he was told this by a US general, and he is willing to go before a grand jury and reveal the general’s name. We’ll see how this develops. The whole bin Laden raid-story is coming apart at the seams, in all sorts of ways. The latest claim is that CIA agents had been living in a house near bin Laden’s hideout for nearly a year, keeping an eye on the compound—and no one in the neighborhood noticed...

This conversation took place during the 1988 run-up to the publication of my first book, *AIDS INC.* I include it here because of the recent bin Laden events. Jack has much to say about how hypnosis works and how it is necessary if the public is going to be fooled time and time again.

Q: On the subject of global control, which we’ve been discussing lately–

A: It’s a layer of cover story. That’s what they [elites] do. They promote cover stories to conceal their actions. For example, all the legends cooked up and promoted to explain how Lee Oswald killed Kennedy alone. It’s a movie they play to hypnotize the public into believing what happened.

Q: How does the hypnosis work?

A: Well, there is television. A major component. An authoritative voice doles out a portion of reality. Here it is. This is reality. The story can have any number of holes in it, and they sometimes do, but the underlying assumption never changes. I am the voice of reality, and here is the basic thing. Oswald killed JFK. Or HIV causes AIDS. Same thing. How would the viewer know whether that’s true? He can’t. He has to get his information from somewhere, so he takes it in from the Voice. Okay, the Voice says HIV causes AIDS, so it must be so. The viewer wasn’t there in the lab, and even if he were, he wouldn’t know what was going on. The viewer wasn’t there in Dallas when Kennedy was shot, so how would he know? He just accepts it. The alternative is doubt, and most people don’t like to live with doubt. So he sits there in front of the TV, and the Voice drones on and on, and he’s receiving these light waves from the TV, which are somewhat hypnotic in and of themselves, so he accepts it all.

Q: He buys what’s being sold.

A: Yes, but you see, it’s different from somebody selling kitchen knives on TV. The viewer, in that case, is predisposed to believe that either the sales pitch is real or it’s a fake in some way. He knows he has a choice. But with news on TV, there is the predisposition to accept the ultimate authority of the Voice.

Q: Why?

A: Because if the news is lying, then lots of pieces of what the viewer accepts as reality are lies, too. It's a potential domino effect. And he doesn't want that. He wants reliability. He doesn't want reality to suddenly crack at the seams.

Q: He wants "seamless."

A: Yes. More than that, he wants his own subconscious mind to be seamless.

Q: What does that mean?

A: He wants structure and solidity and consistency in his subconscious mind. You see? That's where he believes everything is engraved in stone. Every person intuitively believes that his own subcon [subconscious mind] is logical and consistent. And he knows that's where the news is going. (laughs) Straight into his subcon.

Q: You've seen this with patients?

A: Sure. I go in there and find whole religious myths, for example. All sorts of stories and tales and fairy tales. And they're perfect. They sit there like published pieces. Everything nice and neat. This is what it means to be a "good citizen." Your subcon is nice and neat, and everything in there is straight. No contradictions. No cracks in the seams.

Q: So the news tells a person Oswald acted alone.

A: And bang, that goes directly into the subcon. People are like librarians. They want that card catalog system to be perfect. No internal debates. No doubts. It's exact, even if it's the most preposterous lie.

Q: You find that with patients.

A: On one level, yes. But then, under hypnosis, I've also gone below that. And then I find all sorts of different currents of information and energy. It's very different on level two. Level one, the nice neat area, is like a wall or floor that keeps the person from what's going on in the basement. In the basement, there is dynamic change. There is live energy. There is a restlessness. Rebellion.

Q: But people don't want to-

A: Most people don't want to know that about themselves. They'd rather accept any old cover story, no matter how ridiculous it is. They'd rather believe their entire subcon is a perfect and consistent library. Perfection is an absolute lie, but people don't care. That's what they believe they want.

Q: So what happens when you get into this level two, as you call it?

A: It's like being in a wild forest. All sorts of energies are flying around. It's bracing. It's exciting. And when the patient gets used to it, he finds it exciting, too. So let's go one step further. The average person will buy any old elite lie about the

world, because he wants that false perfection and consistency, all right? He INSTINCTIVELY knows that, if he rejects cover stories or spots the holes in them, HE'S GOING TO PIERCE LEVEL ONE AND GET IN TOUCH WITH THAT DEEP SUBCON LEVEL IN HIMSELF, WHERE DYNAMIC ENERGIES ARE IN PLAY...AND HE WANTS TO AVOID THAT, SO HE CAN PERPETUATE THIS FICTION ABOUT HIMSELF.

Q: This fiction that he is consistent and “perfect.”

A: Yes.

Q: All in all, that would seem to be an unstable situation.

A: Damn right! He's really aching to be creative and alive and dynamic, but he's shoved in all his chips on the slender idea that he's an average person who's, in his own small way, perfect. An android. He wants, therefore, to connect with other androids, like the Voice, like the TV news anchor, like that kind of person, so he can maintain this fiction. This fictional world. THIS is what elites are playing into, this is what they're tapping into, this is where they make their money and obtain their power. And I have to tell you, this is what's breaking down, this is what is coming apart. We're seeing that. We're in the middle of it. How it will manifest in the next few years, I don't know. But we're going to see it. It's going to be a struggle. The elites will continue to spin their cover stories, and more and more people will doubt them.

Q: This “level one” you're talking about...this is programming, right?

A: Sure. It's a combination of lies from elites and it's also self-programming. NO ONE CAN PASS THIS OFF AS MERELY THE FAULT OF EXTERNAL FACTORS. THEY DO IT TO THEMSELVES.

Q: I keep coming back to the subject of painting.

A: Well, it's a good thing to come back to.

Q: We have this tradition in painting, whereby everything in a picture is balanced, there are certain definable harmonies and symmetries and so on...

A: I know what you're getting to here. If people look at paintings and they don't have these traditional qualities in them, [people] dismiss them as crazy.

Q: Right.

A: And this is very much like the “perfect programming” that people seek. They want their minds to be orderly and balanced and harmonious in very childish ways. This is how they deal with information, too. The information needs to come in with a certain voice, a certain flavor, a certain surety, a certain stupid simplicity. This is what people are looking for. It's like those “cheap crap” stores people love. They go in there anticipating the most superficial stuff. And on one level of the mind, the programming works that way, too. Give them anything else and they reject it.

Q: Also, they forget it very quickly.

A: They do that, too.

Q: So this has to do with global control.

A: You bet. Certain assumptions plugged into the mind will, like magnets, attract whole batches of information and automatically reject other batches. For instance, X IS THE ENEMY. Whoever X is, a whole river of information comes in that bolsters that idea, and then if you say, "Wait, X is just a puppet and a cover story cooked up to fool you," the person will go blank. Blank. It doesn't add up for him. It makes no sense.

Q: Well, let's get down to it. Who put that idea, X IS THE ENEMY, in his mind?

A: It came from outside the person, from media, from government, but HE PUT IT INTO HIS OWN MIND. Let's not have any doubt about it. Something can come in toward you, and you can deflect it. You can cast it aside. Or you can nod your head like an android and take it in and set it in stone, in your subcon. You see, this is the basis for hypnosis, although not many people know it. What does it mean to be suggestible? What does that mean? Are you mentally crippled? Is that a native condition? No, it isn't. To be able to be hypnotized, you need a whole background of programming yourself to be an android. If you don't have that, you're not suggestible. You're not a good candidate for hypnosis.

Q: So we live in an android culture.

A: Damn right we do. It's the basis of the society. It's a kind of pattern, and lots of people LIKE IT. They're not being fooled. Not really. They want it. They see it as attractive...and then they work out their lives so they build that android-ness up in themselves, step by step and brick by brick. If that weren't the case, these elites that are working toward global control wouldn't have a prayer. They wouldn't have anything to grab on to. And when you have a whole collection of androids, what do you have then? You have collectivism.

Q: Everything for the group, nothing for the individual.

A: Suppose X really isn't the enemy. Suppose, as suggested in [Orwell's] 1984, he doesn't even exist. Or suppose he is a potential enemy, but he's being manipulated by higher people. In any of these cases, you could get a war waged against X. The war involves two sides. Death, destruction, pain, suffering, powerful emotions, heroism, endurance...all of that. A great human drama plays out on the world stage. It becomes a central reality. And the androids lock in, because for them, X IS THE ENEMY, and that's all there is to it. Nothing subtle about it. No conditions attached. All that previous self-inflicted android programming pushes this war into being and there you have it. Reality manufactured.

Q: You can bleed in a cartoon.

A: Damn right you can. So even if the war is a cartoon, an android production, people still bleed and die.

Q: Back to this level two subcon, where you say so much dynamic and creative energy is bottled up.

A: Yes. This is where new worlds can be energized. This is where you can get the wellsprings of life LIVED. No androids. If this level of subcon becomes more and more conscious...spontaneous improvisation occurs. This is quite, quite different.

Q: How does an android become not-an-android?

A: Something wakes him up. This is what I try to do on an individual level with patients. Over the space of an entire civilization? New ideas are promulgated. People who are “on the fence” start to wake up. A different ripple effect takes place. You see, an android who is completely committed to remaining an android has a shelf life. He declines and then winks out. But he can wake up, in which case everything is different.

Q: He can wake up from the pattern, from what he built into himself.

A: That's right. Because that's all it is, a pattern. It's a pattern in perception, in the way he accepts things “from above,” in the way he denies he has any creative spark.

Q: If you look at the work, at the optimism of Bucky Fuller—

A: I spent years reading him. What I concluded about him, after all was said and done, about his vision of what civilization could be...you see, all these innovative ideas he planted in the culture, when you boil it down, there has to be a creative impulse in the individual, and the individual has to run with it, because unless he does, nothing adds up to the New. The civilization will melt, it will turn to dust, it will be automatic. No matter how much liberation you allow to happen, generally speaking, over the range of a culture, you have nothing unless the individual does that [creates]. If he just sits there and reaps the benefits, it will all be for naught. New elites will come along and ramp up a story, a lie, about what's really going on and how it's necessary to rally the Group behind an idea, and so on, and the whole decline will begin again.

Q: So it's not enough to punch holes in cover stories and lies.

A: That helps. But it's not the total answer. Not by a long shot. Look what happened with the JFK assassination. The media “space” was growing rapidly at the time. There was room for more information. So Mark Lane came along and wrote a quick book about the assassination and it was put out by a major publisher. All of a sudden, people started to disbelieve the Voice. Then came a flood of further information about the murder. New ideas. People began waking up to the fact that reality was being manufactured for them. But it wasn't enough. The creative element didn't come to the fore powerfully enough. People who saw through that

JFK lie felt disenfranchised. They felt on the outside looking in. They didn't know what to do. I mean, there were years of political protests during the war [Vietnam] that followed, but that petered out in the 1970s. In its wake were a lot of pissed off people, but they didn't know what to do, either. They were very anti-government...but then, what happened and what's happening now? People are actually believing that government is the solution. They want to give government more power to "take care of" the less fortunate members of society. They want government to become the caretaker and the messiah. Government is no such thing. For every apparent good deed government does, it exacts a price. More power. More control.

Q: So you're saying-

A: I'm saying people have to create a different kind of society. But not just one society. Many.

Q: Decentralization of power.

A: In all sorts of innovative ways. Ways that work. To think that big government can be some kind of answer...this is hogwash. It's a con job. If all you can do is blow up buildings and smash windows, government is going to win—because it looks like the best antidote to that chaos. People will embrace government—that's the typical android reaction. Government becomes the Voice. Listen to the Voice. Obey the Voice. Do you see? The destructive rebellion against government is manipulated...seeds are sown that will make it possible for angry rebels to start committing criminal acts...and then the pull-back comes. People embrace government and then government takes over more territory...more control. Under the guise of doing good deeds for the "underprivileged," it assembles a greater collectivism.

Q: It's a shell game.

A: Always.

Q: And this "android programming"-

A: Allows it to happen. Instead of creating many new alternatives all over the place, decentralized societies, you get a more intense search for the central Voice that will tell everyone what to do. And the Voice sounds nicer, so that seems like a good thing. But it isn't.

###END###

October 22, 2011

This conversation with Jack contributed to the eventual creation of the Magic Theater. (*More about the Magic Theater at this link:*

<http://jonrappoport.wordpress.com/2011/09/22/magic-theater-and-matrix/>)

Q: Talk about the word “identity.”

A: It’s a poor word, a lousy word, a deceptive word, a meaningless word—because it seems to encompass the whole individual. If a patient “loses his identity,” he’s got nothing left. He’s in a vacuum. That’s nonsense. He doesn’t lose his identity. I prefer “role.” There are many roles. You can pick one and act it out, and if you don’t like it, you can throw it away and pick another one. There is no “identity.” It’s a phony word, in this context.

Q: So in hypnotherapy, you don’t fool around with “identity.”

A: Of course not. I sometimes present a stage, a theater, though. It’s a space where the patient can picture anything he wants to. It’s open. It invites creative action. It has characters on it. Not mine, the patient’s. A stage gives you real experience.

Q: An example?

A: The patient invents a scene. Let’s say he puts a mother up there arguing with her son. Drama. Then, a few stragglers show up and mill around. Then, a tiger walks out on the stage and starts talking.

Q: A tiger?

A: Sure, why not? You have something against tigers? He talks about his life, or he talks about the price of coffee, or he talks about the mother and the son. I’m not doing any of this, you understand? I’m not making any suggestions. The patient is. He fleshing out the scene. Some remarkable things happen. Often, it’s fun. The patient feels liberated. He can populate a stage with characters.

Q: Sounds a little like Psychodrama.

A: Yes, but you see, the patient picks the roles. And there is no way to know why. Or what connections exist to him, if any. It’s wide open. Just like existence. Why hem it in. We have whole universes to play with. Once I had a man who staged a whole Central American revolution on stage, in his imagination. As I recall it was secretly bankrolled by Coca Cola. He was laughing much of the time. He had CIA people moving in and out, KGB, Chinese spies, ETs. It was like a Bosch painting reworked by Groucho Marx. At the next session, he told me he’d just had the happiest week of his life.

Q: Opening up things.

A: Of course. That's the whole point. You invent characters and you have them talk to each other and do things to each other. I picture it as a kind of tinker-toy set expanding out of the mind. A set of characters. It's the change from mono-theme, which is the setting of the mind under usual circumstances, one theme, one attitude, one circle of emotions you play over and over—you extend mind with characters popping out all over the place. You theatricalize the mind, and the mind seems to want that, seems to have been waiting for it.

Q: The word "mono-theme." That strikes me as very important.

A: Well, that's what mind tends to do, see. It takes one central viewpoint and everything comes out from there. It's like the mouth of a trumpet. All the music comes out there. Mono-sound. And then, and this is the revolution, you change that. Instead, the person invents characters, roles. All sorts of roles. Any roles. King, peasant, slacker, alien, ant, fly, tiger, tree that talks, rock that talks, sky, a cloud, a piece of gold, whatever. And there is no formula for picking these roles.

Q: Now, is the patient under hypnosis when he does this?

A: He's in a light trance, which is to say he's relaxed, he isn't thinking about ordinary stuff.. He's in an easy frame of mind. But I'm not making any suggestions to him then. I'm not telling him what stage to invent or what characters to choose. None of that.

Q: You're making basic assumptions about reality?

A: Damn right I am. I'm assuming that people live in a shrunken reality, much narrower than they want. But there they are. And this is a problem. You might say it is THE problem. From it flow all sorts of difficulties. So I'm setting the stage for people to open up that narrow reality. I'm encouraging that tendency. I'm opening the windows so more light and air can come in. Look at it this way. A guy goes into his garage and sees his old hopeless car. Lots of things wrong with it. He fixes this, he fixes that, he hopes the car will last. He tries to hold on to that car for as long as he can. So what is he thinking about? The one car. The only car. But instead, I introduce him to another garage in which there are 100 cars. Bang. Everything changes. Well, this is the mind. It tends to focus on a limited number of things. It works those things over, and eventually the mind feels there is a cloud of a problem looming overhead. Why? For no other reason than it is focusing on a very limited number of things, possibilities, ideas. The things themselves really aren't the problem, although the person certainly thinks so. No. The problem is the narrow focusing. The constant massaging of the same material, the same old stuff. Over and over. So I open all that up. I set the stage so the person can imagine and invent 30 new things. On a stage. Characters interacting. Some characters stay, others disappear. It doesn't matter. Nobody's keeping score. No rules.

Q: At first, this seems counter-intuitive.

A: Yeah, because the person has the habit of massaging six things in his mind over and over. But then the light dawns. He can invent characters, personae, roles. He can do it. He can do it without concern for plot or story or tight definition. He can just do it willy-nilly.

Q: So his mind relaxes.

A: It relaxes and it becomes more active, more adventurous, more imaginative. The patient feels this happening.

Q: From problem-consciousness to creative consciousness.

A: Yeah.

Q: Is reduction ever the answer?

A: Sure, if you're engraving somebody's name on a plaque. You concentrate on that and nothing else. But generally speaking, no. Some people suggest that if you can reduce thought and mind to zero you'll be fine. Better than fine. Well, let's say you could do that. Then what? Sooner or later you're going to have to create. You're going to want to create. And that's where reduction doesn't work. You'll create one thing and one thing only? No. Create widely, with energy. The political destination of the power elite in this world is reductionism as a philosophy. But not for themselves. For everyone else. It's a con. It's a game wherein they try to convince people to shrink. As if shrinking is the answer. Shrinking is never the answer. Shrinking creates the apparent necessity of groups. The individual is submerged. That's ludicrous. It's theater with no theater. It's like religion. See, religion is making a bet. It's betting that the imagination involved in its stories are enough, are enough for the masses, are enough for the masses to say, "Well, I can't imagine any kind of theater better than the theater in these religious stories, so I'll stick with the Last Supper and Jonah and the Whale." That's what it all comes down to. It's silly. But there it is. The bet. And I'm betting on the opposite thing. That a person can come up with stuff that makes those coagulated religious mass-stories look like child's play. And I've been proven right. And when that happens, the patient becomes more joyful, more flexible, more alive. I like that. I like to see that.

Q: You're running your own theater.

A: Yeah, I guess I am. The theater of expansion.

Q: When you have a patient, and he's doing this kind of theater you describe, does it matter whether it's tragedy or comedy?

A: That's an interesting question. Here's what I've found. If a patient starts out with sadness and gloom, if he keeps going long enough, if he keeps populating the stage with more characters, things get lighter after a while. It happens because he's offloading reductionism and shrunken realities. He's getting rid of that, and so his

mood lightens. Things become more juicy and alive. He's feeling his oats. He's flexing his creative muscles.

Q: And that affects his state of mind and his feelings.

A: I told you, some time ago, that I stopped doing traditional hypnosis with patients, because I found that most of them were already in a hypnotic state. Some part of them was already in trance and reacting to old suggestions. At that point, my job was to figure out how to reverse the hypnotic state that was already there, was already in place. The answer was: get them to create. Get them to imagine. That reverses a hypnotic state. A hypnotic state is a state of reduced mind. Traditionally, a trance is induced to prepare a person for suggestions. But he's already acting and thinking on the basis of suggestions. So what good does it do to add more crap to the pile?

Q: From an elite-control point of view, you'd want a whole population in a trance, so you could run their behavior through suggestions.

A: Yes, and that's already happening. Media are the instrument for conveying suggestions. So our job is not to swat all the suggestions like flies. There are too many of them. Our job is to eliminate the trance. But even that isn't enough. Because a person who just woke up needs more. He needs an overall direction. He needs a way to approach life. The approach is imagination and creating. But you see, you don't create much if you don't use imagination. Imagination gives you new avenues along which you can create.

Q: That kind of knocks out the idea of revelation.

A: Revelation is something you see suddenly. Something you never saw before. So suppose I could snap my fingers and make you experience a revelation. Then where would you be? You'd be sitting there seeing something fantastic. For how long? A minute? An hour? And then what? You only know seeing. (laughs) Get it? That's all you know. Seeing. And then what you're seeing fades out. And then you're just there. You don't have anything to do. People have a confusion about this. They think if they see something new, it's all they need. That's baloney. They need to imagine and create, because that's endless.

Q: Correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't recall any religion with that doctrine.

A: (laughs) That doctrine would be a sure-fire way to empty out the churches.

Q: Maybe we need to start a religion.

A: The Church of Create Your Ass Off.

###END###

October 29, 2011

JACK TRUE ON ULTIMATES

Here is another interview with my late friend and colleague, Jack True, innovative hypnotherapist and philosopher.

Twenty-three years after the conversation, I've written an introduction to it:

STEVE JOBS AND THE TECHNOLOGY FETISH

Over years and decades, I've watched religions and quasi-religions spring up and flourish and disappear. I've watched some of them become hard and nasty. Little dictatorships. I've watched people, overnight, drop into fundamentalism. The clothes, the hair, the slogans. I've watched spiritual movements soften and spread out into the culture like attenuated marshmallow, hypnotizing their followers into believing in imminent apocalypse. The "good kind." Space aliens. The Force. Gaia. The Universe.

"And a Prophet will arise among you."

The eulogies for Steve Jobs testify to the love of his products. I'm trying to figure out what the weeping was all about. The inconsolable weeping.

So let me speak as a representative of the Stone Age.

I don't own a cell phone or a laptop. I work at a sturdy three-piece block that sits on my desk and doesn't go anywhere. I don't know who manufactured it and I don't care. I wrote my first book, *AIDS INC. — Scandal of the Century*, on a portable typewriter in 1987. The manuscript, chapter by chapter, was retyped by my publisher on what he called a word processor. I wrote *The Secret Behind Secret Societies* on an ancient computer. The screen was black and the letters were orange. The floppy disks were converted to little hard discs by Dave.

But when I was 22, in 1960, something new hit the scene. Audio cassettes and cassette recorders. Until then, it was all reel to reel. The shift to cassettes was rather astonishing, because you could carry around a little machine and record people. You could interview them. You could tape (badly) their music. (Much later, when I did hours and hours of lectures for my San Diego publisher, I would sit at my desk at home with a cassette fieldpack and a mike and talk.)

No one at the time (1960) went RELIGIOUS over audio cassettes. There were no armies of geeks who publicly celebrated the change and made Prophecies about the Dawn of a New Future.

The first time I had an inkling that people were taken with the technology itself was 1977, when a friend told me jazz musician Joe Zawinul had a little inexpensive tape set-up he used to record himself playing piano at home, and the sound quality was professional.

I asked my friend if he'd heard any of these home recordings. Was it good music? He scratched his head. Of course he hadn't heard them. But that wasn't the point, he said. The point was you could establish a home studio for very little money. I persisted in thinking the music was what was important. That's my fetish.

I had reacted to stereo the same way, when it first came in. The idea that the sounds of different instruments were channeled into separate speakers seemed like a bad idea. In clubs, I had never heard music that way. Rather, it came at me like a wall of sound. That's what I was used to. And surround-sound was particularly absurd, because who cared about hearing music moving in from behind? Ditto for headphones. I didn't like them. They produced sound in a space I didn't care about. For me, the music (live) was always coming from a bandstand and traveling to me on a line. Even if that was actually an illusion, given the placement of speakers in the club, it was the way I conceived it.

Messianic prophets, of course, have been touting Digital as the awakening of mass salvation. The machines and the programming are what counts.

And this machine worship is somehow tied in with the popularity of the equipment, as if we have proof, by the degree of consumer demand, that we're indeed entering into a new age.

A movie called *The Social Network* arrives on the scene. It's hailed as a masterpiece, a "reflection of the enormous changes the culture is experiencing." Changes in what direction? Is the fact that a billion people can announce their existence to "friends" achieving some sort of instant magic? Are we supposed to celebrate the arrival of a boy billionaire? Is the praise for Mark Zuckerberg's work any different from the kind of admiration ladled on the earlier breakthrough in creating the Barbie Doll series?

Does consumer demand automatically make a product vital and wonderful and even spiritual?

Think about how this demand (audience response) operates in the area of politics/media-

"Well, Joe, I think he handled the press conference well. He said all the right things. He didn't make it appear he was reading from a script. The Independent voters out there are going to like this."

In other words, it doesn't really matter what the pol actually stands for. It only matters that the broad audience will like how he said what he said.

And so a product like Facebook is judged solely in terms of how consumers react to it. If they love it, it's an innovation. It's satisfied a hunger. It must be brilliant. More than that, it must be heraldic. It must be a step forward in the evolution of the species. It might even be from God.

"Zuckerberg knew what the public wanted before the public knew. That was his genius."

As if, what else could genius be about? You see a hole in the market, you develop a product, you sell it into that hole. "Well, that's all IQ has ever been. Even a guy like Einstein—he knew the world was ready for some kind of relativity, so he put together a theory and sold it."

And the iPad. It's wonderful because people want what it allows them to do? Before it appeared, people didn't realize how much they'd love it? But then, there it was, and it struck a universal chord? And therefore, it's automatically AMAZING?

So if the Roman Church has a billion members, that means the Pope is a tremendous person? The Pilgrimage to Mecca is good because millions and millions of people make it?

"No, no, no! You don't get it! All these devices give us multiple options for instant global communication. We can reach out anywhere in milliseconds!"

Yes, I agree. It's good. But that does mean people should actually weep when Steve Jobs dies?

Should we place flowers on the grave of the inventor of the Walkman?

I'm just pointing out that times have changed. Larger numbers of people have developed a deep cosmic love for machines. (Star Wars, 1977, sparked a profound passion for two of them.)

When walking talking robots come along and serve your needs in the home and at work, address you by name, anticipate what you'll want in the next five minutes, you'll cry when they're superseded by the newer model. You'll bury them in the backyard next to the dog. You'll hang their photos above the mantle. You'll see a shrink to work out the issue of their passing.

Some of you.

And when the man or woman who invented that robot dies, you'll stand outside their building and light candles. You'll agitate for a national holiday. You'll watch the funeral on whatever television looks like then. You'll store holograms of this inventor next to your bed, and you'll activate them on occasion before going to sleep.

And people will say, "That saint knew what we wanted before we did. That's what made him so great. That's real greatness."

Churches will spring up.

"The very meaning of what a thing is, is measured solely by how many people want it."

And as usual, the actual art involved in inventing those robots will be overlooked. Because people will say such talent remains a mystery locked in the genes of a very few. They will say the rest of us are merely ordinary folk who have no imagination at all.

But not to worry. We can put our picture up on a page and list our interests and recount our activities of the day and share them with other people who have the same interests. This is our miracle. This is our reward and our basic hunger, and we can feed it.

Rejoice!

Look no further!

Thousands, millions of little boys and girls will grow up who spend their every waking hour calculating the sizes of audiences. This many people attended that historic concert or that Super Bowl or that post-election speech or the launch of that product or that religious convocation or that parade. To them, the events themselves will mean absolutely nothing. And when these little boys and girls grow up, they'll find a career which allows them to do marketing. Marketing will be metaphysics. It will describe and explain the universe as well as it can be explained.

And many robots will serve them. The marketers will be the most important people in the world. The search for meaning will have reached an apotheosis.

"If X is a person, place, thing, or event, what IS it? Its existence is identical with however many people express praise for it. It is nothing else, and it never was. All prior formulations were in error. Persons, places, things, and events are not composed of anything. They don't exist at all, except insofar as other people like them, love them, want them."

From which two corollaries flow:

It doesn't matter why people want an X or to what use they put it.

And that X which is most wanted is automatically the most important thing in the world.

Doll, fertilizer, dog, applesauce, cigarette, Facebook, nail polish, the Bible, burger, slavery, iPad, Moses, brain implant, ice, microwave, heroin, ice cream—whatever emerges from the pack with the largest audience is THE FINAL AND PROFOUND MEANING OF VALUE.

Amen.

In this formulation, people don't really have anything in their souls except what they want to own. And the main item they pass back and forth to one another is that preference. A few billion people pass, back and forth: I LIKE THIS, I DON'T LIKE

THAT. And what most people like, whatever that is, must have been invented by a transcendent genius.

Facebook and iPad. Their inventors have to be Prophets, right? Not just smart, not just clever.

I don't know. If I have to pick a messiah out of the marketplace, I'm going with the guy who invented the belt for pants. Or the shoe. Or the garage. Maybe the shovel.

I'm weeping for the passing of the guy who came up with the concept of haircuts. That's my church. Why not?

Maybe it's too many people who took too many drugs. I don't know. But I look at an iPad and I remain unmoved. Yes, I know it's smart. Very smart, okay? It can play music but it doesn't invent music, right?

By the way, if you think the revolution in Egypt was started by a hundred "student intellectuals" in Cairo cafes working Facebook, you need more drugs. Or fewer drugs.

So that's my shot from The Stone Age.

And yes, I know I'm typing this on a computer, and I can post it in seconds, and it can travel around the world in a few minutes, and that's pretty terrific. I know that. But I'm not thinking "revelation" or "iPhone in the heavens" or "the new Jerusalem."

I'm not sitting on the floor of my living room building a hill out of dirt and debris, mimicking the place where the Mothership will land and make Contact.

Okay. That's the introduction—here's the interview with Jack True.

Q: People seem to be taken with discovering ultimates. I mean, they want to—

A: They want to escape from themselves and meet up with the Cosmic Radio Station.

Q: The what?

A: You know. It broadcasts information and wisdom at the same time. And the wisdom has this fantastic quality to enter into the brain and mind and transform them.

Q: Like a drug.

A: Well, yes.

Q: So this is what people are looking for.

A: All the time. They're putting out SOS signals and waiting for a response from the aether.

Q: It's like the wrap-up of a story.

A: Exactly. They're looking for the end of the story. It's just like television. Suppose, all of a sudden, all the dramas on TV were shown—for, say, a month—with all the endings chopped out. People would riot in the streets. They'd attack the White House. They'd burn down cities.

Q: Got to have the end.

A: Absolutely. Write a story without an ending and people will say you're subversive. It must be scheme to take over the world.

Q: You see this in your patients?

A: Sure. They think, at first, that I'm the end of their story. I'm the one who will write the conclusion. In the old days, when I was doing standard hypnosis, I had a patient who was all screwed up because he had a story wedged into his subconscious about a war. I won't go into all the detail, but I used to find plot lines floating around in people's skulls. These stories came out under hypnosis. They didn't necessarily have anything to do with the patients' lives. They were just there. And this one was about a weird war. And it had no ending. The patient didn't know which side won. (laughs)

Q: Weird.

A: Very. But I was used to that kind of thing. So I had the guy make up a dozen or so endings to the war. Just cook them up. And the story drifted away and didn't mean anything anymore. But I use that illustration to show you how important endings can be to people. Ending equals Ultimate. They're essentially the same thing. "How does it end? I have to know."

Q: With an Ultimate, the person has to know and he has to possess it himself. He has to be there and live it.

A: And of course, that ending has to vector in from Somewhere Else. You see? That's what magic is to most people. It's the ending that floats in from the aether. The final illumination and enlightenment. The funny thing is, people will grab on to almost anything. The culture gives it to them. The culture could give them cookies and milk and they'd take it, as long as enough people accepted cookies and milk as an Ultimate. That's all it takes. Other people accepting it. Cookies and milk. A king with divine right. A new car. A trip to Italy. A climb up a mountain where a lost city once existed. Doesn't matter.

Q: People are very keen on "the latest trends," when it comes to Ultimates.

A: Yeah, that's what I mean. The legitimacy of the Ultimate derives from the fact that other people, lots of other people buy it. A guy writes an article about a shaman in the jungles of South America who says the Rain is coming. And this Rain will be the last thing that happens—and after that, we'll all experience The Great Change

and that will be the ending. See? And that article gets repeated over and over, until it becomes a Prophecy. And lots of people are talking about it. Attributing special symbolic importance to it. And then some person in Atlanta hears about the Rain from twelve of his friends, and he says, "This is what I've been looking for. The Rain. This is the ending I've been seeking." He's got to have an ending. So he grabs this one.

Q: Because, if he didn't have an ending?

A: He would be on his own. He doesn't like that. He doesn't have the wherewithal to figure out what to do then. He doesn't see himself as a person with extraordinary resources, so he doesn't know where to start, where to dig in.

Q: So that's where the Big Audience is.

A: Hell yes. If you want to build a big audience, give them endings. Narrow it down to One. The Ending. Teach it, preach it. The enslavement of the whole world. Even that could be an ending. It sounds awful, but at least it's an Ultimate. See? People will grab that. I'm not talking about whether such an enslavement is actually going to happen. Doesn't matter. Sell it anyway. You'll have an audience. Anything that smells like an ending—they'll grab it. Their psychology demands it. Their conditioning demands it. They've got to have an ending.

Q: What about The New Future?

A: Yes, that works. On one level, it sounds like a non-ending, but to the mind it tends to register like an ending. To a lot of minds. Because The Future comes across like a fait accompli. "From that moment on, when the future arrives, everything will be different. We'll all be in a different space. We'll know what we need to know." Even freedom can work that way, if it's twisted in the right way. People will think of freedom as an ending because they don't think about action. They think about possession, as in owning something. "I own freedom." Therefore, everything is okay. They have that abstract idea called freedom—it's given to them on a silver platter, and then that's the ending. A complete delusion.

Q: I suppose security and protection can work that way, too.

A: Sure. More endings. "When the State has all the means necessary to protect me, I'll be in a safe cocoon, and then I'll be fine. I'll be an Ultimate." It's very, very, very shortsighted, of course, but a mind can buy that. BECAUSE THE MIND IS LOOKING FOR AN ENDING. A REVELATION OF SOME KIND THAT PROMISES A VAGUE PERFECTION. Here's another one. "Technology will save us." What the hell does that mean? How in the world is technology, all on its own, going to save anybody?

Q: It's a totem

A: It's transplanting a very old idea on to a new thing. The technology is new, and the idea of Pagan Illumination or Tribal Apotheosis or whatever you want to call it is

grafted on to that. The technology buffs see themselves as a kind of special tribe—mostly, I think, because they want to believe they have a “primitive kind of strength.” It’s just like kids who buy caps with the logo of their favorite sports team on it. But in this case, the technology crowd –a lot of them—come from a cerebral background. They didn’t play sports. They want to seem rough and tough in some way, so they love this idea that they’re in a tribe, a clan, with special powers. It is like rubbing a totem or an amulet. And they build this up in their minds, and then they think it’s their Ultimate—they’re members of the Tribe who will take the rest of us into the Promised Land. They’re the muscle-minded leaders. They’re really the ones who’ll take us into Outer Space.

Q: The technology tribe.

A: I had a patient who was trying to bring me into one of his groups of friends. See, I would be the “mind specialist.” I would be the guy who had all sorts of wise things to say about the power of the mind. I opted out, of course. I didn’t want to have anything to do with it. Besides, this guy had a boatload of problems with his wife. He needed some serious help. He had gone into marriage thinking it was the Ultimate that would end all his problems. And he found out he couldn’t talk to his wife at all. He was tongue-tied. When he came to me, he thought I would put him in a trance and make some suggestions to him, and then he’d wake up and all his problems would be solved. It took me a few months just to convince him that wouldn’t work.

Q: Why wouldn’t it work?

A: Because a person isn’t a machine. Despite all evidence to the contrary (laughs), a human being is alive. These technology people have all sorts of naïve ideas.

Q: So what did you do with him?

A: I put him in a very light trance, and I had him invent lots of dreams about his wife. Situations that would never occur in ordinary life. He came up with space voyages and trips into underground cities and so on. I mean, LOTS of dreams. This went on for many sessions. And then something happened to him. He began to see he could talk to his wife—about what was most important to him. He was in love with the idea of going out into space. So began to talk to her about that. She was very relieved that he talking at all. She listened. And then, gradually, she opened up to him. And it went from there. He was staggered to discover that they could talk about things.

Q: Did you know it would turn out that way?

A: I had a hunch and I followed it. A lot of people are afraid of what happens on a day to day basis.

Q: What do you mean?

A: They think if they just give in to living every day, something bad will happen. So they look for an Ultimate. But the Ultimate can be injected into the every-day reality and transmute it. Completely transform it. And when that happens, the Ultimate turns into something else. Not just a Final Principle, but a path into action. That's the test.

Q: What's the test?

A: Take the most profound thing you think, and inject it into your life. See what happens to it then. Maybe it collapses and falls apart. Maybe it can't stand up to the every-day. But maybe you find what you're looking for. You get a platform for real exploration. Let me give you a negative example. You've got all these military and intelligence people playing around with computers. After a while, because computers process information, these people think they've got their hands on something mystical. Pieces of information, run through machines—they see that as mystical. Because they're buffered off from life. They live in compounds. They get weird. They play their games and they think they're approaching some sort of religious revelation that will give them the power to control everything with information and the machines that process information. They think that "everything is information." See, that's an Ultimate. But these people, as I say, are living an artificial existence. They never really get to test that theory in real life. They have no real life they can just walk into. Everything for them is military. They think that there is a sum total of pieces of information, and if they can build big enough computers, they can run the sum total and something like "God" will come out the other end and they'll have it. But information is just information. It isn't naturally imbued with power or life or the kind of subjective slant that can give a person leverage for his future. And neither will the sum of information. No matter how big the sum is.

Q: The same thing is true about technology in general.

A: Yes. I mean, you can become much more facile when you have better technology. But we've all known facile people. What do they get in the end? Nothing. You need more than facility.

Q: So what are we supposed to do? Strip away technology and strip away all that facility from people?

A: Can't do that. Doing all this work with patients, I've learned you can't do "surgery." You can't remove the things that are bothering people. You certainly can't remove things people think they must have. You can't take that away. Even if you could, it wouldn't do any good. You have to establish a setting in which they discover, for themselves, other options, other ways of living and being. When I have people, for example, in a light trance and I have them invent many dreams, all sorts of dreams, that's what's happening. The accretion of other possibilities. It bleeds into their consciousness. Sometimes quickly, sometimes slowly. You take a horse who's spent many years dragging a carriage around, with a bit and harness, and you

put him out into a field, he'll slowly realize he has space. And one day, he'll trot, and then he'll run. He'll start running. He'll get to that. Well, with a human being, there isn't just one thing he'll do. He's not just destined to realize one thing he was built for. A human has all sorts of choices. But he'll come to them, and he'll make a choice, given enough time and enough space.

Q: And enough invention.

A: Yeah. When I have a person inventing dreams, that's the elixir. That's the thing that opens up the spaces. Many spaces. That's what pulls the trigger on transformation. In the absence of invention, people will reach for some sort of unmoving Ultimate, because that's all they can see.

Q: But you're not against technology.

A: Of course not. You think I want to live without a light bulb or a refrigerator? I like technology. I want to see the human race get out into space in a big way. But if the love of technology becomes an Ultimate, I think we'll lose the necessary will. We'll mess around with lesser technical things. We won't see the need and the adventure on the big stage. We'll bog down. Going into deep space is about us, not the machines. It's destiny for us, not the machines. If you asked people whether they'd rather have a little device they could put on the roof of their car that would move around and wash and wax the car and crawl under the hood on its own and check the oil—or a real rocket ship that would take ten people to the middle of the galaxy, I don't know...I think a majority of people would rather have the little thing for the car. And if ten companies made those little machines for the car, and if people talked to each other about the relative benefits of the little machines—you see how we can get caught up in technology as the main subject, when it's just an adjective hanging from us and OUR future.

Q: The Church of the Robot.

A: Yeah, that's coming, too. "I named my robot Lulu. What's your robot's name?" "Mike. Can Lulu make dinner in less than ten minutes from scratch?"

###END###